DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 389 SE 051 298

TITLE Task Force on Women, Minorities and the Handicapped in Science and Technology: Executive Session. Report of the Proceedings (Cambridge, Massachusetts, April 8, 1988).

INSTITUTION Task Force on Women, Minorities, and the Handicapped in Science and Technology, Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 88

NOTE 141p.; For the final report, see "Changing America: The New Face of Science and Engineering," SE 051 294.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; College Science; *Disabilities; *Elementary School Science; Elementary Secondary Education; Engineering Education; Equal Education; *Females; Government Role; Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Science and Society; *Science Education; Secondary School Science; Technological Advancement; Technology

IDENTIFIERS *Task Force on Women Minorities Handicapped

ABSTRACT

The Task Force on Women, Minorities, and the Handicapped in Science and Technology was established by the U.S. Congress in Public Law 99-383 with the purpose of developing a long-range plan for broadening participation in science and engineering. Public hearings were held in Albuquerque (New Mexico), Atlanta (Georgia), Baltimore (Maryland), Boston (Massachusetts), Chicago (Illinois), Kansas City (Missouri), and Los Angeles (California) between Fall 1987 and Spring 1988. The final report of the task force was produced in December, 1989. This document is the verbatim transcript of the meeting. Co-Chair Mr. Jaime Oaxaca conducted the meeting. Discussions include: (1) An opening statement; (2) Hispanic, Native American, Women, Disabled, and Black target groups; and (3) preparations for the next meeting. (CW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED317389

# TASK FORCE ON WOMEN, MINORITIES, AND THE HANDICAPPED IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS of a meeting of the Subcommittee Task Force on Women, Minorities and the Handicapped in Science and Technology held on the 8th day of April, 1988, at the Cronkhite Graduate Center, Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and presided over by MR. JAIME OAXACA, CO-CHAIR.

PRESENT:

Co-Chair

Mr. Jaime Oaxaca, Corporate Vice President
Northrop Corporation
Kansas City, MO

Members Present

Mr. James A. Biaglow, Project Engineer
NASA Lewis Research Center
Cleveland, OH

Ms. Ferial Bishop, Chief
Registration Support and Emergency Response
Branch, Office of Pesticide Programs
Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC

Dr. Jo Anne Brasel, Professor of Pediatrics
Harbor UCLA Medical Center
Torrance, CA

Dr. Mary E. Carter, Associate Administrator
Agricultural Research Service, USDA
Washington, DC

Dr. Alan Clive, Equal Employment Manager
Office of Personnel and Equal Opportunity
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Washington, DC

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sue Kemnitzer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SE051298

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. Mary E. Clutter, Division Director
Cellular Bioscience
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC

Dr. Joseph Danek, Deputy Director for Research
and Improvement
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC

Ms. Jill Emery, Deputy Director
Women's Bureau
Department of Labor
Washington, DC

Dr. Essex E. Finney, Jr., Acting Associate Director
Agricultural Research Service, North Atlantic Area
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Philadelphia, PA

Ms. Claire E. Freeman, Deputy Assistant Secretary
of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy
The Pentagon
Washington, DC

Dr. Ruth A. Haines, Deputy Director
Center for Chemical Physics
National Bureau of Standards
Gaithersburg, MD

Ms. Stella Guerra, Director of Equal Opportunity
Office of the Secretary of the Air Force
The Pentagon
Washington, DC

Ms. Penelope M. Hanshaw, Deputy Chief Geologist
for Scientific Personnel
Department of the Interior
Reston, VA

Mr. Norbert Hill, Executive Director
American Indian Science & Engineering Society
Boulder, CO

Dr. Harriett G. Jenkins, Assistant Administrator
Equal Opportunity Programs
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Washington, DC

Ms. Antionette G. Joseph, Associate Director
Field Operations Management
Office of Energy Research
Department of Energy
Washington, DC

Ms. Brenda Kay, Staff Assistant to the
Assistant Secretary for Water and Science
Department of the Interior
Washington, DC

Ms. Stephanie Lee-Miller, Assistant Secretary
for Public Affairs
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Washington, DC

Ms. Fran Lopes, Assistant Director of Recruiting
and Special Personnel Programs
Office of Personnel Management
Washington, DC

Mrs. Barbara Morgan, Teacher
McCall, ID

Mrs. Shirley Peterson, Administrator
of the Office of Employment Security
Department of Labor
Washington, DC

Mr. Raul Ernie Reyes, Director
NASA Quality Assurance
Kennedy Space Center, FL

Dr. Miguel Rios, Jr., President
Orion International Technologies, Inc.
Albuquerque, NM

Dr. Lawrence Scadden, Director Rehabilitation
Engineering Center
Electronics Industries Foundation
Washington, DC

Mr. Nathaniel Scurry, Director of the Office
of Civil Rights, EPA
Washington, DC

Ms. Patricia Smith
Department of Education
Washington, DC

Mr. Alvin Thomas, Manager
Navigation and Landing Division
Federal Aviation Administration
Washington, DC

Ms. Sonia Mejia-Walgreen
Mansfield, MA

Ms. Vera (Nina) Winkler, Deputy Director
Planning & Evaluation Service
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC

Reported by: ABL Associates
2254 Hall Place, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007

Thomas O'Rourke, Verbatim Reporter
(202) 337-4609

INDEX


| CLOSED SESSION | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Mr. Oaxaca - Opens Meeting | 6 |
| II. | Mr. Reyes - Hispanic Target Group | 8 |
| III. | Mr. Hill - Native American Target Group | 22 |
| IV. | Dr. Brasel - Women Target Group | 40 |
| V. | Dr. Biaglow - Disabled Target Group | 73 |
| VI. | Ms. Bishop - Black Target Group | 90 |
| VII. | Ms. Kemnitzer - Next Meeting | 130 |

MR. OAXACA: Good morning. Sue would like to do the housekeeping first, and then we will attempt to get started.

MS. KEMNITZER: [off the record]

MR. OAXACA: I understand that there are several folks that are leaving here before the time we've set for adjournment because they have to catch--or attempt to catch--airplanes--if the last two days are any trend.

So what is the earliest that people have to leave here? Could we have an 11 o'clock show of hands. Does anybody leave at 11?

?: I'm trying to leave at 10.

MR. OAXACA: Oh, Mike's 10.

?: Check out time is at one.

MR. OAXACA: OK, so we probably ought to try to get most of the hard-core stuff out of the way by 10 to 10:30 and then do some wrap up.

I would start off this morning's session by saying that we have come a long way. We are now at that stage where we can do all the wonderful nitpicking and second guessing. I would suggest that everyone put on their thick skin because now comes the crunch part.

We have to come up with a report that is going to be punchy. It's going to be short. It's going to be readable. It's going to sell. It's going to make us look good, yet because it is an interim report it gives us an out to spend another year and a half fixing things.

We need to get it out there in a way that will have some impact as we structure to set up a public relations effort so that this can indeed do what, you know, one of the testifiers yesterday talked about getting everybody's attention.

I think we all owe a vote of thanks to Deborah, and that's to soften her up when we tell her what a crummy report it is today [laughter and inaudible comments]. Deborah is here on her deathbed almost. She sounds terrible.

And so I thought we would start off. It appears that if nobody has any difficulty with the order that we use, we want to do the target group discussions and since Ernie's group has to leave--you have to leave at what time, Ernie?

MR. REYES: At 10:15.

MR. OAXACA: At 10:15.

MR. REYES: And Rios has to leave at 10.

MR. OAXACA: Does anybody mind if we start with that one since they have to leave? You're on, and this is the report from all the Task Force people and then the content of the report itself, where we start homing in on the final product that we are going to come up with after a lot of time.

And some of the comments that I have personally gotten, and I purposely stayed away from any of these Task Force things so I wouldn't be biased. The inputs I have gotten is that it is too long, it is too wordy, it is not punchy enough, it needs a short executive summary at the beginning, it

needs a title that has ownership right here with this Task Force, it has too many recommendations, it has got to be focused more.

Those are some of the general comments on the content of the article. It needs more specific things in the action plan. It needs numbers.

We, of course, got the comment yesterday from Dr. Holton on cost assessment estimates, which are going to really be tough, and now we will get the inputs on the different target groups.

So, Ernie, you're on. I think we ought to...

MR. REYES: Now that Jaime has covered everything we are all going to talk about, let me fill in the blanks, if I might, Jaime.

MR. OAXACA: Yes.

MR. REYES: The Hispanic target group comprises Stella Guerra, Sonia Mejia-Walgreen, Dr. Rios, myself. We met yesterday afternoon and concluded the report. I might add there was some very dedicated people up to about a quarter to one in Sue's room. I think you know who you are, the four, two chairmen, with the exception of Jim because you were out of... you were asleep or something.

We spent quite a bit of time and these people should be commended for their effort, and I think these people in that room last night are indicative of the caliber of people that are here.

I say that because we went off as Hispanics to look at the report, but in our heart of hearts we were not looking at this from a Hispanic standpoint but from our overall standpoint.

There are pluses and minuses of breaking into the various groups--I can't see Mr. Hill talking to himself or four Hispanics talking to themselves and other people all in larger jamming groups.

But anyway, we took a swipe at the whole thing and we have four major concerns. The first is that we are like a bunch of lemmings running to jump off the cliff. We have the feeling that we're rushing the report and we shouldn't be.

We have got one hearing under our belt yesterday, we have got another one in Baltimore. If we are looking for a July date, then we should be looking at the middle of May as a dang good interim report possibly.

But anyway, we shouldn't be rushing.

While it is an excellent idea to share the new report with the leading political contenders, we must remain a bipartisan and not get affiliated with an administration that is going out, but maybe think of the administration that is coming in.

So we must make sure that we share what we have, but that we retain the total concept until we finish, because the finished report will be more comprehensive, and I will cover that on my fourth concern.

That was our strongest concern. And our second one is we need--we feel strongly as a community that we need to reformat that report. All of us are in various bureaucratic and industrial organizations where you read a lot of literature, you have a lot of stuff coming in front of your face or your desk in the in basket.

This thing needs an executive summary, as was mentioned before, with the recommendations stated, that will come in the first part of the report.

The body of the main report then needs to be more concise, with no repetitions, and the recommendations need to be structured so that they are highlighted bluntly or underlined once, and structured relative to the actions that have to be taken or the policies that have to be issued.

Third, we believe that the report should be more broad, or issued on a broader basis or a broader perspective. If we treat it only as women, minorities, and the handicapped, then we are going to get biased of an EEO or a special emphasis project.

The report should have national appeal. We have a national problem. We should center on a typical thing--we talked about the crisis in education, a nation at risk relative to the lack of its citizens going into science and engineering, etc., etc.

We need a broader perspective that has more interest, so all the folks know that we are concerned--not just about

women, minorities, and the handicapped, but about the national problem, of which we are dealing specifically with a section of it.

We agree--fourth point--with Dr. Holton that the report will be more meaningful if we include dollar figures on what the recommendations are projected to cost. All of us in our daily lives, anytime we have a project for our boss or bosses, the first thing nowadays that they ask is: What's it cost? What's it going to cost me? Where is the money going to come from?

We have been working very hard to come up with some firm recommendations, but all of them, I do believe, cost money, and if we are going into the real world of Congress and appropriations, we need to have a guesstimate on the projection of costs.

That can be done two ways. The Task Force can guesstimate the cost, or we can assign some staffers to research the figures and use previous data or at least get a ballpark figure on what some of these major recommendations are going to be.

We talked about the ROTC-type endowment plan with a loan-forgiving thing. That has got to have some limitations on it. While it is an excellent program, when you go into the legislative bodies, you have gotta tell them what it is going to cost. Otherwise, there is no free lunch, folks.

And lastly, we have a recommendation--we as the

committee that met--to the Task Force. And we recommend that we talk and get the President--whichever one it happens to be--that the years 1990 to 2000 be declared the decade for women, minorities, and the disabled in science and technology.

We are going to get this off and running, but to have a high visibility you have got to have a PR, and we choose 1990 to the year 2000 because we are going to come up with an interim report this year.

The charter says you will have a finished report in January, and by that time it is not 1989 but 1990. We have included a bunch of comments, editorial, a lot of wordsmithing, and we have submitted a marked up copy to Sue.

And here again, I think the people did a good job. Unfortunately, when you are trying to satisfy 120,000 people here in this room, it's tough to satisfy everybody totally.

I think it's a good effort, but I think it needs--not I but we think it needs more polishing.

And that's the substance of our comments, Sue.

MR. OAXACA: Ernie, one of the key assignments that the target groups had was to look to see how the particular topic was treated. What did you folks conclude on how the report treats the subject of Hispanics?

MR. REYES: We took care of the editorializing, like we didn't like the words that, "Cubans are better educated," because we believe the right phraseology was that, "People, in general, that have a higher socioeconomic standard have a

tendency to push their kids toward college and good degree plans."

So the respect of how were the Hispanics treated, we took what we thought was some offensive language out of the report, and those are all editorialized. There was one specific there where somebody was saying that we're going to use rock disco to recruit Hispanics. Not all of us have rhythm and obviously I don't think that is very true of Hispanics. I think it is true of the whole population maybe.

So we have fixed those items with the editorializing, Mr. Oaxaca. We took some out, we added some. We redlined it out, we deleted some that we thought were offensive to the Blacks. We left out some statements that we thought were very offensive to the white males in the report.

So in general we took care of all that good stuff with editorializing and wordsmithing.

MR. OAXACA: Did you address the issue of--one of the axes that I have to grind with Hispanic parents, that Hispanic parents are not as responsible as Asian-American parents...

MR. REYES: No.

MR. OAXACA: ...in pushing the kids.

MR. REYES: No, we did not, and here again you're talking about one of the things that we did mention. We mentioned a few things about Asians, but we do not have a general topic that says, "Asians were not included in the report because of the unwritten rule that they don't have a

problem."

Here again, the Hispanic parents are no different than the Black parents and no different than some of the white parents with respect to the interests of their children.

We didn't feel that was a Hispanic issue. We felt this was an overall issue, educating the parents.

MR. OAXACA: Yeah, OK, I buy that. I think we have to treat that. I just, you know, because we're obviously doing something wrong on day one, because the results show that we are not making any headway. In fact, we're losing ground.

MR. REYES: By the way, when we discussed the Hispanics, there is a pecking order in the Hispanics just like everywhere else and everything else, and these are not in the order of importance, but you've got Mexican-Americans, you've got Puerto Rican Americans, both islanders and from the Bronx--mainlanders, you've got Cuban-Americans from southeast Florida, you've got them in the rest of our population.

You have the Mexican-Americans all the way from California to west Texas to south Texas to Iowa to Kansas to Florida, all over, and so there was a wide spread of Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cuban-Americans, and other Latinos and Latin representatives, very small sectors.

And so, when we looked at that, that was our first going in step, we were looking at the whole spectrum of Hispanics, and I think like I said before, you have heard our major comments.

I might ask of any of the other Hispanic members of the groups have anything to add that I may not have covered.

Stella?

MS. KEMNITZER: May I just prompt you to mention something we discussed, and I thought your points were very well taken, so I would like to ask you to recount them to the group, about the issue of technicians in community colleges?

MR. REYES: The technician portion of the report we had not seen before during our hearings and testimony. There was testimony from a lady from Los Lunas, New Mexico, they talked about the technician institute there.

We heard testimony from a few other areas, and we came out with a report, and the report specifically was saying that possibly we needed to look at how we do our technicians and compare nationally and internally. We didn't think that was required.

The other thing--we were talking about warehousing of students where the kids will go to school for a two-year AA degree and possibly want to go into others, and other folks would go and take a four-year technology degree and all it allows them to do is technician work.

But one of the key things in the report was asking is we don't know where our technician forces come from and what do we do with them, and our group concluded that the technician work force in this country--I would say 80 to 90 percent--is what comes out of the armed forces.

We have a lot of young people that go into the branches of the armed forces that get good, excellent technical training. When they come out, some take a little bit of college, but most of them go on to job training with various companies, and if somebody is saying we need to go study and look at the technician work force, I don't think so, because I think we have some answers. All we have to do is do some post-exit interviews with the armed forces men and women and you'll find that that's where your answers are right there.

Did I cover that, Sue? [pause]

MR. OAXACA: All right, did you have somebody else from your group that wanted to make any comments?

MR. REYES: I was going to Dr. Rios, Stella and Sonia, see if there is anything I left out.

DR. RIOS: I think Ernie has summarized it quite well for me.

MR. OAXACA: Estella?

MS. GUERRA: I agree. We had lots of discussion and we know that even as the Blacks make their comment, American Indians, we will still have some overlaps of things that affect all minorities.

So I'm sure that as we listen to other comments we might end up coming with some other things that might be of interest to Hispa ic groups also.

MR. OAXACA: The more you can get specific to Sue and Deborah and Betty the better they will be able to implement and

start honing down on the report and shaking it out. It's the classic proposal activity. Draft number 36 will probably do it. Yes, Betty?

DR. VETTER: I'd like to ask one thing of the Hispanic group, because you're here and while you're here. The Hispanics--there is no such thing as a Hispanic group with... characteristics, as you have just in effect said. For instance, the Cubans and the Mexican-Americans have such different characteristics in terms of their educational attainment, all of these other things.

If we were to do anything about the Asians, the same thing is true. Asian-Americans are not all alike, any more than Hispanic Americans are, or even white Americans as far as that goes. But we don't have the differentiation in the white group where we can characterize it, except by socioeconomic.

If we are going to do anything in the report, do you want us to simply stick with the word "Hispanic," meaning all of these groups? [INAUDIBLE]...of these groups.

The Cuban Americans are doing fine, as far as I can tell.

MR. REYES: It is the ones that are out and working in real life--the second and the third generations that are down in Miami or in Orlando that are not getting the education, that are joining the street gangs, that are not going to college, they are becoming just as Americanized as the rest of the community.

DR. VETTER: Well, you told me something. I've got--I've been collecting data and I now have quite a bit that shows me that the Asian American third generation...

MR. REYES: Same thing.

[Several people speaking at once.]

DR. VETTER: But I thought when I was talking about it, I thought I meant Hispanic who came across the Rio Grande. I didn't know I meant Hispanic who came in from Cuba, too.

So, if this is true, we have a major problem that at least might be referenced in this report.

[Several affirmative comments.]

MR. OAXACA: One of the things that you might want to...

DR. VETTER: ...our immigrant population turns out to be a very bad thing to do.

MR. OAXACA: One of the things you might want to address very, in a very short way in the report is just to point out that Hispanics are not a monolithic situation, and even within the Cubans, you know--there's always a joke that a Mexican becomes a Cuban when he gets a job.

The issue that you have to address there that even amongst the Cubans is a function of when they came into this country. The first ones which came in, which were the so-called elite. They were already the professionals, they had taught their children that way, they were very aggressive.

And then as other folks started to come out, and then

the ones that came out last time, of which a whole bunch ended up in prison because they took folks that were already in bad shape to start with. That's a different set of folks.

MR. REYES: I don't believe we needed a doctoral dissertation in the report on the various slicing and shaping and categorizing of Hispanics. I believe the Hispanics ought to be a capital H, just like the Blacks ought to be a capital B, and just keep it generic in the report.

Otherwise, you are going to go out there and you are going to be picking watermelons and melons and cotton and not know what to bring back to the table.

It's really too widespread for this report. We're talking on one side of our mouth that we need to trim it, and then on the other side we're talking about let's expand it.

MR. OAXACA: Ms. Winkler.

MS. WINKLER: I think one way we can deal with this is--not belabor it to death--but there is sort of an economic cut which I think is the most important cut when you are splitting these groups up, as far as I think the level of detail that we are going to go into in this report.

We probably don't want to spell out a million targeted programs for each subgroup, but I think making the distinction that, in a lot of cases we care more about economically disadvantaged as far as many minorities are concerned.

That's not necessarily going to be true for the

disabled because economic disadvantage isn't the only problem, but it is a very large part of the problem.

Now in some cases with Hispanics you will also have a language problem, which I don't really see addressed here, and I'm not sure even how to address it, but certainly that economic, if we're designing programs to address particular problems, one of the things we need to look into is whether those programs should be means tested.

MR. OAXACA: Estella.

MS. GUERRA: One of the things that we had some discussion about and I think there was a thin level of discomfort for each of us was the way that the report addresses the Asian-American population, because we almost just completely just put it aside by saying, they're doing well.

But at the same time, we are saying we don't have enough U.S. or Americans going into the Ph.D.s or getting their higher level. And I think that while they might be doing well we're still on the other side saying we don't have enough and this is a brook that should be included into the higher level.

And so this we just couldn't come up with an answer, and I don't know if anybody else has addressed it, but I think the Asians as a minority group are not treated fairly in this report.

We're--it's almost like saying, they're doing well, so we made some editorial comments about that.

DR. VETTER: I think it isn't part of this because we

have not stated in this report something that is true. The Asians in our science and engineering population are all foreign-born.

Ninety-five percent of all American Ph.D.s who are Asian are foreign-born. The Asian people who are born here, among all U.S.-born Ph.D. scientists and engineers in the United States, two-tenths of one percent, and Asian [INAUDIBLE] in the U.S. population is about 2 percent.

And so the native-born Asian-American is highly underserved in the science and engineering community, and I have all kinds of data to show that.

MS. SPALLEN: [INAUDIBLE] to be the right hand main text of the report and if we were going to have boxes, these insert texts [INAUDIBLE], I can't hear, I mean, I can't hear, but I [INAUDIBLE].

MS. KEMNITZER: May I just say it? We're planning--we would like to have a box on each of the target groups, including the Asians, and the advice you are giving us here will, of course, be put into the body of the report, but also we would like to highlight some of these points that we have raised here in those boxes, and hopefully take care of some of these ambiguities.

MS. SPALLEN: Thank you, Sue, but the other question I just want to put on the table, not that you have to answer it, is, whether as a result of this morning's discussion, the group feels that they really want to have a box about Blacks,

one delineating Hispanic situation, one delineating the Indian situation.

MR. OAXACA: Why don't we get all the reports and, you know, we'll get a feeling for it? Why don't we...?

MS. SPALLEN: It may be a great idea, it may be [INAUDIBLE], or it may be a little bit too, I keep thinking, distracting.

MR. OAXACA: Yeah, all right, we'll see how it starts in [INAUDIBLE], now that we are into the final prose.

The next group, and we would go a half an hour in order to get out of here in time, starting off at the top--Norbert for the Native American, would you like to give your report.

MR. HILL: Sure. As in many cases, I was a group of one, so this is my report, other than Barbara Morgan and Sue Kemnitzer expressing an interest last evening and we did [INAUDIBLE]. Yeah, Indians have adopted lots of folks.

One of the things that Joe Danek brought up, and I agree with him and I noticed in the report that it includes American Indians, I think to have some legitimacy in Alaska, you have to include Aleuts and Eskimos, which they don't see themselves as Indians, and they want to be classified that way. So I think that [INAUDIBLE] someplace needs to be written in that regard.

DR. JENKINS: Should it be Alaskan Natives, or should they spell out Aleuts and Eskimos?

MR. HILL: I will get the correct language for Barbara. One, I would recommend a box or some kind of discussion regarding the unique relationships of American Indians to the federal government, federal agencies. Most people don't understand that.

We are--technically I am a ward of the government, so--and the government is the trustee, and that relationship has never been explained, nor do people understand why Indians have such problems.

I think there is more things in common in terms of achievement in science than there is diversity, but we still have 278 different tribes in the lower 48 and another 300 communities in Alaska alone.

So you talk about the diversity of the Hispanic community, we got a lot more in the Indian community.

MR. OAXACA: Could you explain that ward of the country. I mean I really am not aware of what that means.

MR. HILL: Indians didn't become citizens until 1924. I have citizenship in my own nation, the Oneida nation, as well as citizenship in the United States.

We were--our land is held in trust. The Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior holds our land. It's almost like we can't do our own business, and that's why the term of self-determination for American Indians is so important.

We have not been able to do anything without the

Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Department of Interior signing off in terms of what we do, in terms of our land, in terms of our own stability in the government.

So, it all emanated from treaties and land cessions and several other things in the history of the United States for the Indians. It is a very complicated thing, different for every tribe, and I don't think we want to write that all in the report, but it is a different and unique relationship that I think people--see a lot of Indians don't see themselves as minorities. They see themselves as nations.

And then there's legal descriptions that we are domestic, dependent nations.

MS. SPALLEN: Could you say how that affects education and aspirations and things like that?

MR. HILL: Well, it affects education because nothing has been done. It's just like Custer said, don't do anything until I get back. Well, nothing's been done, so, I mean [laughter], and so there is the [INAUDIBLE] between, of the other economically disadvantaged group or ethnic minorities that Indian kids are probably the worst of the lot.

And I think most Indians would agree with that, and so I think that the recommendations should be compatible with where tribes are going and the responsibility of the federal government, and I have made several recommendations of terms of how they, that could be done.

And I don't think there are a lot of other things

that we had talked about.

But the other thing is, when there was discussion yesterday about set-aside funds, don't just say set-aside funds for women and minorities, because we'll get very--and Indians will never see the light of any nickels, because of that.

So I think it has got to be set-aside for American Indians, Alaskans and Aleuts. And that's the only way that you're going to get science education and training and mathematics, or whatever the case may be, to the American Indian communities.

So I would strongly make that point. I think the report needs to be bold. I think it needs to get people excited and angry or both. I didn't find anything offensive about Indians, but I think we have to get up beyond the stage of [INAUDIBLE], and have a report that is striking, that it doesn't gather dust, or has a short life.

And I am not a copy editor, so I don't know how to shorten it. I think I've learned a great deal from it, but I agree it's a too long...

MR. OAXACA: Are you going to supply or have some colleagues and yourself supply to Sue and Deborah the bold part? I don't think anybody on the Task Force is worried about being too bold. We probably are more ignorant than anything else.

MR. HILL: No, that will be done.

MR. OAXACA: Did you find the recommendations having

applicability in a substantive way towards the Indian situation?

MR. HILL: Yes and no, not real specific in terms of what we need. One of the things that we need some baseline research and data, which we do not have. And all the data is really suspect, and we're in a position where you have to either draw your own data.

But if the NSF could help us establish research centers, so we can collect some data and we can get some common ground in terms of the needs and desires of communities to figure out where we're going to go with this stuff.

And that's really one of the biggest problems. You have got 278 people calling Joe Danek, trying to figure out what each individual tribe should do. I think there has got to be more of a one voice in terms of education and achievement and things [INAUDIBLE].

MS. BISHOP: Can I ask a question? This is a committee of the whole. This is a question for just educational point of view. The tribes that you're talking about, the 278 nations, is it the feeling of those nations that they wish to remain independent 278 independent nations, or is there a feeling that they want to mainstream and flow into the rest of America?

Blacks, for one, had always said that we want to be a part of America and be assimilated into American life. Is this the same feeling for Indians?

MR. HILL: Absolutely not. Indian people do not want to be mainstreamed. They want to maintain their independence as an Indian people to help them survive.

Now I have always had trouble with the mainstream because--and just the term. I want the mainstream river to run through reservations, and there are [INAUDIBLE] of it that I think Indian people should have the opportunity to jump on or jump off.

But in terms of saying that we just want to mix in and be assimilated with the total, it's just not going to happen. It hasn't happened for 200 years and Indians will die before that ever happens.

MS. BISHOP: The reason I bring that up is that I think that's a point that a lot of people--that it needs to be brought out in the report, a one-pager in the appendix which talks about the whole business of American Indians and how they think and their thought process.

MR. HILL: That's right.

MS. BISHOP: Should be a part of this, simply for that purpose.

MR. HILL: And I'm giving that information to Deborah, and I think that needs to be articulated.

MS. BISHOP: Therefore, Deborah's question, which talks about how does this impact on education, may be a different twist. Instead of trying to be Secretary of Education Department, you may have a different goal, because

you are having 278 independent nations around.

MS. GUERRA: I have a question also. When you speak of Native Americans, is it also correct to include the island people, the Hawaiian natives? Aren't they, isn't that all part of Native Americans? I think that they consider...

DR. VETTER: They go to the Asians, under the classifications that are being used.

MS. GUERRA: They go with the Asians. Because they call themselves Native Americans and come under, in the education business.

MR. HILL: There are some programs where native Hawaiians are treated the same as American Indians.

MS. GUERRA: That's right.

MR. HILL: The--Senator Inouye, who is Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, if he gets his way, native Alaskans and native Hawaiians will be part of American Indians.

Incidentally, Inouye is probably the best things that happened to Indians since Custer, so Indians are going to go along with this because I think we're going to get more in the end.

So in some programs they are considered the same as Indians and treated that way, sometimes they are Pacific Islanders, and others--it's a lot of confusion.

So, technically they are not federally recognized as an Indian with reservations.

MS. GUERRA: We have research and training centers for Native Americans and they are included in that, and that's why I...

MR. HILL: But it's not a blanket kind of coverage, at this point, legally.

One of the other recommendations that I had is that, and this could be done by the Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, is to change one of the Bureau boarding schools into a magnet school focusing on mathematics and science.

It needs to be done and if we leave it to the Bureau, it will be another 80 years before we even talk about it. So, a strong recommendation from this group I think would help make that happen.

And it could be a model school in terms of...

DR. VETTER: Is there an important Indian school for each tribal group?

MR. HILL: No.

MS. GUERRA: No.

DR. VETTER: OK, in Indian schools, is there any tribe...?

MR. HILL: There are several kinds of--there is contract schools where tribes have contracted with the Bureau and they have their own reservation schools.

There are several boarding schools, maybe eight or 10. They have been closing some down in the last several years, but like Flandrel [PHONETIC] or Tomawa [PHONETIC], which

is in Salem, Oregon, they recruit kids all from the Northwest. It's a new facility. They have probably got 500 kids there. It's a boarding facility. It's like a prep school.

DR. VETTER: All the high schools are boarding.

MR. HILL: No, not all of them. Ninety percent of the Indian kids go to a public school of some sort or tribal school in their own communities. A small percentage of them go to a boarding school.

Years ago they all used to go to a boarding school and come home in the summertime. That's not true anymore. There's several left, maybe, I don't know, 2,000--I don't know what the data is, in terms of how many kids actually go away for high school.

Now what's coming out of those schools is that the mean ACT out of those schools is about 10, and we're spending a lot of money that doesn't make any sense.

Those schools could be refocused into centers of excellence for people that really want to go to school and learn.

MS. SPALLEN: Mean ACT [INAUDIBLE] percent on the boarding schools [INAUDIBLE]?

MR. HILL: Boarding schools and...

DR. VETTER: Both.

MR. HILL: Both. I'm ashamed to say that, but that's the truth.

DR. JENKINS: So, essentially American Indian

youngsters at the elementary level participate in American public school systems, and the issue is, are their needs well served? Are we making recommendations that will help improve the education of those youngsters?

MR. HILL: I don't know if you want to hear all the specific recommendations, to Indians. I can either...

MR. OAXACA: Yeah, you might want to--what I wanted to do--we have to...

MR. HILL: I can do that...

MR. OAXACA: Dr. Brasel has to leave also.

DR. BRASEL: Not until 11.

MR. OAXACA: What time?

DR. BRASEL: 11.

MR. OAXACA: Yeah, so we'll go next with the women's report, and so, you know, we got time set aside. Yeah, I think everybody ought to hear it so they can, when they review the thing, and we get to work on this report for a little longer on the next go, then we'll have a better feel for it.

And by the way, before you start, let me--I've been remiss--let me welcome Miss Patty Smith from the Department of Labor who--I mean Department of Education, who has just joined the Task Force, welcome and get to work.

MR. HILL: One of the other recommendations that I had was math enrichment for seventh, eighth and ninth graders. Our organization is doing five camps this summer just to get kids geared up for freshman algebra, because if they don't get

in the pipeline of the math sequence, they'll never become scientists and engineers.

Fellowship and centers for teachers of American Indian students to be certified in mathematics and science. That's important to improve the quality of science education.

Regional academies in science and mathematics in different regions of the country, so you can accommodate for the cultural differences between the Southwest and the Northeast and the Northwest and Alaska. So I think the regional academies and efforts in regions of the country could work easily.

Again, I talked about the set-aside dollars specifically for Indians, because if it is not targeted for Indian junior colleges, tribes, schools, or Indian organizations, we are not going to see any of that stuff make a difference for Indian people.

A registry of American Indian scientists and engineers that could be coordinated by the National Academy would add some prestige to identifying who American Indians are.

There's a lot of people who want to identify for whatever reason to be American Indians. There's 20 million people in this country who think they're Indians. There's only 1.4 they can give you a name of a tribe they belong to.

And there are a lot of opportunities that people who say, I'm an Indian, to take advantage of the resources

available. So we have got to make sure we hit the right target. But we would like to figure out which tribe they are from and get some data in terms of what's out there, and the NSF or the National Academy could coordinate such an effort.

DR. VETTER: Isn't there something already going at the AAAS? Isn't Shirley's project running--Shirley's gone, isn't she?

?: Yeah, she's gone.

MR. HILL: Not that I know.

?: I'm not sure if [INAUDIBLE] the data he's talking about.

MR. OAXACA: Say that, Betty, say that again.

DR. VETTER: I thought Marina Green had started and Shirley was continuing through--I'm not sure in what way--trying to set up a register of Indian, tribal Indian scientists and engineers.

MR. HILL: Not that I know of. We've got as much data as anybody else in the country, so I...

DR. VETTER: There's something.

MR. HILL: Well, I will check on it.

DR. VETTER: We need to check on it. I don't know, it may have fallen to the wayside when Marina left AAAS, I don't know.

DR. SCADDEN: This was about 10 years ago, I know that that was absolutely true within the Office of Opportunities in Science, I thought.

DR. VETTER: Right. And maybe it's been dropped since Marina left, I just don't know. But this is [INAUDIBLE].

MR. HILL: The articulation between junior colleges and four-year institutions needs to be strengthened, and that's probably an issue for a lot of groups, but kids going into junior colleges, they have got to be able to be some transferability with some credit given to what the work that they have done before.

And also a coordinated internships with federal agencies and Indian tribes. How do you build opportunities for, like say, the Bureau of Land Management?

Kids could serve internships there if they are studying civil engineering, and they also could do internships with tribes, and they could begin to work together, and I think that will help both parties to do that.

MR. OAXACA: Are you going to treat the part--I had never really understood what you said that Indians, by and large, want to remain an integral part of the Indian nation of that particular tribe, and have the option to either become or not become part of the mainstream?

And that probably presents a different situation when you then try to see how that fits in to science and technology because by and large the jobs that these Indian engineers would get conceivably will be outside the nation, the Indian nation, in the mainstream.

So now you're--it appears to me as an, I have no

record of having been other than a Chichimeca [PHONETIC] down in Yucatan Peninsula, which is not viewed as an Indian tribe--to be a--you're now in the situation that perhaps you have to come up with the solution to that unique situation to still sell to the Indian kids that they ought to go into science and engineering.

You know, I would hope that you are going to treat that in your--in a bold way.

MR. HILL: There is a way we do that, because the economic development on reservations, it's limited, and kids coming out with degrees in science and engineering, there is no place to go back home.

One of the things would be having internships with federal agencies that builds bridges of opportunity, so that kids can connect what they are learning in science and engineering back to the reservation they came from, and they could do some internships and research and contribute to the tribe.

One of the goals that we have in our organization is to have the Indian people contribute back something to the community in which they came from.

Now, you may have to work at IBM for several years, but there are plenty of Indians in California and Los Angeles and in Chicago. So they can contribute to an Indian community. They don't have to be exactly on their reservation.

As time goes on, there will be more and more

opportunities in the areas of science and mathematics for tribes, so we just have to build a critical mass. We are the smallest group, the one that's most ignored. We just need to present opportunities that make sense for Indian people so we can maintain our cultural integrity, as well as take advantage of opportunity of jobs and employment and economic development. So that will be treated in that way, that focus.

MR. OAXACA: OK, thank you very much for your report. Deborah, you had?

MS. SPALLEN: I just had a quick comment. Norbert and I talked extensively, because I just thought it was right to [INDIANS], and the answer to that question that I came up with was the finding and others that the days [INAUDIBLE], and now, in fact, what happens is that it is very pluralistic, and if he makes it through, gets a degree, he feels he should go back to the reservation, gets a job, or go into the other side of the world, and it's now more pluralistic.

And I think it is very much in the spirit of our report, that it isn't, the tribes have realized that they need this technical expertise, and so the tribal leaders are much more hospitable to having the kids come back and apply for jobs.

And it's very much in the tribe's interest because they don't want to be exploiters. They would rather have the Indians work for the company, for the reservations...

MR. HILL: Also you have a tremendous brain drain.

You either take the best and the brightest and you take them off and you transport them to Chicago. We got the poorest of the poor living back on the reservations.

MS. SPALLEN: So it's quite easy to write because there isn't one answer. It's a question of where the [INAUDIBLE] sees themselves pointed and the extent to which they want to give back in their tribe and what jobs are available.

MR. OAXACA: OK. Joe.

DR. DANEK: Would there not, I mean I think it's related to something you said, would there not be major opportunities then--I mean there's either two ways for an Indian to contribute to his or her nation, that is to physically be located back on the reservation, or for somehow the Indian community or this committee to come up with more effective mechanisms for interacting with Indians once they--in other words, you educate them, you find the quality job, and then you keep them on the string, like you are doing through ISIS and other kinds of mechanisms where you don't necessarily have to live on the reservation to contribute.

MR. HILL: Um hum, that's right.

DR. DANEK: I mean what is being done in that regard, and what could this group do to assist that?

MR. HILL: Well, there is 1.4 million Indian people in this country, half live on reservations, half live in the urban areas, and over 50 percent of them are under age 21.

So, one, we have got to take care of the group that is being educated at this point, because if we lose that group we have got another generation that is not going to get those educational benefits.

If someone is not able--and you hear, become a nuclear physicist. There's not many jobs on the Oneida reservation, and so you have to work for Los Alamos or whatever, but there is also plenty of Indians in that region where they can contribute to the Indian community in some way.

And we are just trying to figure out what those community service options are. Most Indian kids I have met in post-secondary education, what do you want to do when you grow up? I want to go back and help my people.

They don't know what that means, and then the education has really been kind of an alienating factor that, am I still going to be an Indian when I get through UCLA or Stanford or Cornell?

And that is a real major question for a lot of kids, rather than ability, it happens to be who am I when I get out of here?

It is like a foot in two canoes. And I have to play that one, and I'm not very good at either one of them on some days, you know, and so it's.

MR. OAXACA: Taking...

MR. REYES: Jaime, I have a comment.

MR. OAXACA: Yes.

MR. REYES: While I believe that the report ought to try to combine all of the groups for the benefit of all, having been educated in a place, New Mexico State University, where I am familiar, I have colleagues, I have associates, I have some dear friends. And there was always an interplay between the Indian nations, whether they were the Sunnis of northern New Mexico or the Mescaleros of Redoso or whatever.

And they were torn between the culture, a role model, and their technical careers. We have at the Kennedy Space Center, one of our design engineering, an American Indian, and his family is divided.

His son has gone back to the reservation because he felt he wanted to help. He, on the other hand, helps his parents, whatever, but that man is used as a model. He is used as the engineer for Kennedy Space Center in designing facilities for the shuttles, and he is still a member of his nation.

So I am familiar with the nations concept and the various culture in the major tribes of New Mexico and Arizona, but I think the report needs to clear up the ignorance of a lot of people, not knowing that the Indians are a ward of the state type. That discussion, that dialogue must be in the report, and we will start talking about putting boxes, I think you need a special cardboard box by itself for this guy, or a large appendix, because I think we really need to address the Native American Indian as a separate entity, including the programs

that it needs for its own.

?: Why is he still a ward of the state?

MR. HILL: Agree, it may be bigger than a box, so a big box.

MR. REYES: It's their land unless we find some good stuff on it like uranium and oil, then it belongs to the feds, right?

MR. HILL: Right.

MR. REYES: I know that.

[INAUDIBLE comments and conversation]

MR. OAXACA: OK, thank you, Norbert, for your report. We expect a punchy, bold input that's not wishy-washy or wimpy. And after seeing you in action last night, telling the fortune of all the lovely ladies by holding their hand, I can't see that there is animal cunning left in the Indian nations--the oldest trick in the book, I want to tell your fortune.

MR. REYES: Do I detect a note of jealousy there?

MS. KEMNITZER: I want the record to show that Norbert sat next to Mr. Oaxaca's wife, Carolina, last night.

MR. OAXACA: I would like to now ask Dr. Brasel to give her report, so that she will be ready to leave when her flight takes off. Dr. Brasel.

DR. BRASEL: There were several general comments that our group had, and each individual is going to be turning in specifics in terms of their own manuscript additions, etc.

There were some things that we were able to focus on

that were specifically related to women, but another group of more generalized comments.

They should be accompanied with what the recommendations would need to be accomplished, and also the cost of what it would be if we didn't do them, so that both sides of the cost benefit issue, and to accompany the recommendations, not an executive summary, but probably in the body of the report on suggesting ways in which these might be implemented, that is, an action plan at a level of government at which these actions might be required executive versus legislative versus local groups.

In addition, in relationship to the money issue, we felt it was important to point out that new dollars are going to be needed. That is, that we can't accomplish these initiatives by redirection of current dollars, and that some of the recommendations that we would want to make, particularly with regard to women, are not going to be terribly costly, but may be very cost effective.

For example, more flexibility in leave policy, so that women can re-enter without a lot of difficulty, doesn't cost a lot, but it saves you that talent and they aren't lost forever.

And that re-entry issue is really almost solely a women's issue. It's not one that comes up much with regard to the other groups we're talking about.

In addition, shared jobs has been mentioned. It's

not an expensive action item, but would, again would keep within the work force well-trained people who are now being lost.

We felt that somewhere we need to make a point that each federal agency that is using up these groups needs to have some responsibility in replenishing the pool, and that that is one aspect of federal responsibility we would like to see emphasized that, you know, that they need to play their role in educating and providing the training for the people, in the groups of people they are going to use.

Other issues that relate specifically to women is one of the technician issues, which we also had a little trouble with that paragraph. We are not sure there is much data around with regard to really who is in that group, but we think that it is likely that many women and minorities are in the students that go to the technical schools and the need to emphasize was brought up yesterday, the importance of setting things up so that people can go from a two-year program to a four-year program, that transfer is available to students, and that they are told about it.

That many of them may get in, see it as a dead end, and in fact, it shouldn't be, and they need to be apprised of their options.

And if we could get a better handle on the demographics of who those two-year people are, then we might be able to develop a little better, more focused program in

helping them move beyond the two-year, the two-year school programs.

We would like to see emphasized that minority women suffer from double discrimination, both gender and race, and that puts them at particular risk.

We also think that some, quote, "women's," unquote, issues really aren't women's issues, that good child care is going to be important for everybody in the community. For families where you have two careers, child care is as much a problem for the father as it is for the mother.

And so in today's world, that is not a women's issue anymore, it's a national issue.

We would like to see the report separate the issue of role models versus mentors, in the sense that we tend to use them interchangeably, but we think that's probably true.

A role model probably needs to be gender and race specific, in general, whereas a mentor is somebody who provides support, contacts, information on how to get things done, how to succeed in the world, but does not need to be either gender or race specific.

The former, real role models, are going to be harder to come by. It may take another generation to grow up a whole group of role models. But mentors ought to be around and we ought to try to mobilize them as quickly as possible.

We would like a point emphasized in some way that in regards to the women's issue, that we have got to develop an

effort to alter the treatment of little girls from a very early age, in school, on the television, ads, etc., etc., which deflect them away from science and technology, and we have got to get that turned around.

And we feel that some of the women teachers might be the most at fault in this regard, and that may be one of the areas we want to hit in terms of general education.

Other things, other comments here which I will turn in to Sue are more, the more general ones, the issue of focus in more of our data, not necessarily in the report, but as part of an appendix, that our group also came up with.

And I think that most of the other comments that I have down here really are much the same as the other groups have come with and don't need to be mentioned again.

MR. OAXACA: Discussion. Yes, Mary.

DR. CLUTTER: Yes, I would like to add maybe three comments, because I think there were some very significant things that came out of that testimony yesterday.

One of them, which I feel is critically important--Jo Anne has already mentioned--is the whole issue of child care, and I think that was very well demonstrated yesterday, and I would like us to be very bold about that.

I think there is some legislation now pending in the Congress, and I don't know that we want to support that necessarily, but I think that by being bold I mean a kind of social security program. I mean paid child care.

It is in the national interest. I don't know whether we want to say, as the legislation suggests, that there should be child care for four months for both parents, either/or both parents can apply.

MR. OAXACA: Maybe, at that moment, at this point, we could maybe ask Mrs. Emery to maybe make a comment on that. You were working that with your boss.

MS. EMERY: As you know, there is legislation on the Hill right now for parental leave. So we have to see how that--that is unpaid parental leave.

?: Can't hear you.

MS. EMERY: I said that is unpaid parental leave, that they are working on right now. But many companies--what we are saying is that we should allow that flexibility for the employer to do that for his paid employee, and as we take a look at the demographics of the year 2000, because there will be a shortage of workers, because the majority of the entrants will be women--that's what we have going for us.

If we take a look, we are going to need those talented women, and so it is, it will be a recruiting tool, actually, for those employers to hang onto those women and to say, yes, we have all kinds of benefits for you to keep that woman--child care, dependent care, job sharing--all of the things that were brought up this morning.

DR. CLUTTER: I guess what I'm saying is maybe we shouldn't leave it just to the employer, put that

responsibility. Maybe it is a national issue and maybe there needs to be a national social security kind of program.

MS. LEE-MILLER: Can I respond, just to respond?

MR. OAXACA: Ms. Lee-Miller.

MS. LEE-MILLER: Certainly I agree that child care is essential for working women. I would be concerned, however, that because it is such an important public policy issue right now that we could skew our report and kind of go down the road of changing our focus considerably.

There is pending legislation, and I would not like to see the focus of our research get swept up in another issue, which carries with it supporters and opposition, which we need all of in order to obtain the goals of our educational objectives.

So, I think that we should talk about child care as one of the range of support systems that women certainly need to participate effectively in the work force, but I would not really want to see it become a priority of our report.

I just think we would be buying another issue--that's important--but I think it's another issue and away from this one.

DR. CLUTTER: I would like to know how other people feel about this, because I have found a big turnaround on this, because I was certainly not a supporter of child care in the past.

MR. OAXACA: Ms. Winkler.

MS. WINKLER: I tend to agree with Stephanie. There are a lot of details now that are beginning to come out, that while you can say we all believe in motherhood--this is the original motherhood issue--there are a lot of issues that are being debated out there and we could easily get sucked into them, and I'm not sure we want to.

On child care, for example, maybe this is just a let's be a little cautious about how we approach this issue. There is a debate going on and there is research now just beginning to hit the streets on the choice of family day care versus day care centers, the pros and cons, as well as the cost of both very different--you know, do you want a voucher system, do you want a required?--there's a lot of very--it's not a simple issue at all.

It's a very complicated one, and you kind of have a choice of either going in completely and doing it right, or treating it in a very simplistic, shallow way, which loses some of our credibility.

And I think we can note the importance of this and somehow come a way in on favor of some serious public dealing with this issue. I'm not sure that we want to come back and say we are in favor of every mother getting $160 a month to pay--or something like that, which is the way, in the end, the proposals are going to have to be when you really get into federal law.

MR. OAXACA: Ms. Bishop.

MS. BISHOP: It seems to me there may be a compromise situation, and I will speak to it in our report, but one of the things that I talked with Sue about that the report does not do is support a buy-in.

And by that I mean, what are the consequences if Americans, the powers to be, don't pay attention to our recommendations? What impacts the whole situation of what our work force is going to look like in the year 2000?

Which does have an impact because we are still going to have children. We are still mothers, but yet 50 percent or more of our work force is women, therefore do you stop them from having children, or if you do, what do you do with the children.

There is an interrelationship there that necessarily doesn't have to be a bold recommendation, but I do see that as being a part of the buy-in that I'm calling, which talks about the consequences of people not taking our recommendations seriously, because that is an indirect fallout.

MR. OAXACA: Ms. Lopes.

MS. LOPES: One of the things I would like to follow up on that with. I think, as we walk through, it's been brought up that if we dilute the overall intent, and we will get so many issues going that perhaps it will difficult.

I think the buy-in concept could very well be handled if we have an appendix for each of our groups. For instance, if we had an appendix that discussed minorities and broke down

the Hispanic, Black, so that we had something that addressed each of the individual concerns for them.

For women, a major concern could be child care. Although it is a national issue and as parents, we are all impacted by it, it is the women that have felt it to date, and the nation has got to come to grips with this as a national issue.

So if somehow if we could say that in testimony certain issues became obvious to this Task Force wasn't commissioned to address them, nor do we feel we have the time or adequately, but that the nation needs to take action and therefore supporting some of the kinds of efforts that are going on.

MR. OAXACA: Barbara.

MS. MORGAN: This is probably saying the same thing but if we acknowledge...

?: Speak up.

MS. MORGAN: This is probably saying the same thing but if we acknowledge in strong language that there is a problem, day care is a problem, and that this Task Force recommends that the leaders and the people of this country take a strong look at it and do something about it, rather than saying what we're going to do, but that it is a problem and we need to take a look at it.

But we are not recommending necessarily what [INAUDIBLE].

MR. OAXACA: Dr. Jenkins.

DR. JENKINS: I was going to suggest a different kind of compromise. First of all, if we are talking about the President and an executive order, and that's going to federal agencies, that is something federal agencies can move out on to explore and look for ways to develop appropriate ways to treat the child care issue.

And there are a number of federal agencies that are doing that. Some NASA centers, using their nonappropriated funds, employees have figured out ways to provide those services at the installation.

So there are models already, and maybe we could at least move to ask federal agencies and look at some of those examples and to adopt them, rather than just standing off and saying it's a problem, and leaving it to the nation to address.

I think there is one key issue: women are telling you that their careers in science and technology are quite different because they had to deal with issues [INAUDIBLE] difference between family and career.

And so it is very critical to the main topic of our report and so I don't think we should ignore it.

MS. MORGAN: Harriett, maybe we can also include some examples of private areas that provide day care for their workers as well, whether it comes from the workers themselves or comes from the business.

DR. JENKINS: I think also the issue that it's really

a two-parent issue, not just the women's issue, and there is [INAUDIBLE] now, just in the last few days, of the economics are such that no two-parent family can afford not to work. They have to work. We've got to address that.

MR. OAXACA: Betty.

DR. VETTER: If we put in anything at all about the child care issue, I very strongly advise two things. First, I think we must distinguish between leave for bearing children, which is a woman's issue, mostly, and child care for children who are already here in a [INAUDIBLE] family.

The other thing I would say is you must be sure to point out a crisis, not just in the [INAUDIBLE] workplace, in the--I'm very proud of Stanford, which has just finally come up with a 24-hour-a-day child care center for its graduate students who have laboratory things going all night, for its medical students, for its nursing staff, for its staff, and graduate students, because of the fact that the biological clock and the graduate student clock always stick together.

MR. OAXACA: Maybe Norbert will want to change it back to the Stanford Indians, now that they are getting. [laughter]

DR. VETTER: [INAUDIBLE] terribly important the plight of child care on campus for workers and students.

MR. OAXACA: I might make a comment, then we'll go to Deborah. I would suggest that Dr. Clutter has brought up such a non-controversial issue [laughter] that we have to reset the

clock. I would think that with the diversity of ideas that that subject, Dr. Brasel, has to go back to the, to your target group and come up with something that has some sort of consensus.

DR. BRASEL: We have a consensus. We think it's important and that it is an issue for both working parents and that needs to be mentioned in the report. [Several comments at once.] That's our consensus.

MR. OAXACA: No, no, but how, I think is the, how it's mentioned. I heard that there's different ideas that you don't want to defocus, that you want to focus. Deborah.

MS. SPALLEN: This is at the staff's request, as you, I hope, recognize, we are incredibly short-staffed at the office, and I want to acknowledge that Mildred and others have done fantastic research work.

For example, Millie's been working on ROTC, to figure out what ROTC costs [INAUDIBLE].

I would like to request that Mrs. Emery and the others, perhaps Mary Clutter, to send into the office the existing legislation, and I'm sure your departments have got digests of what the projected impact and costs of the bills [INAUDIBLE] government, so that we could at least have available to us, without taking three days of Millie's time because she's got other things to do, right.

MS. KEMNITZER: We have it already.

MS. SPALLEN: We do?

MS. KEMNITZER: Yes.

MS. SPALLEN: Do we have the current status of what the legislation is?

MS. KEMNITZER: Yes.

MS. SPALLEN: Well, all right. Well, the point being, I think we can [INAUDIBLE]

?: Which legislation?

MS. KEMNITZER: All of the bills. HHS provided that to us [INAUDIBLE].

MS. SPALLEN: I never got it. OK, well, we'll then put it in the next [INAUDIBLE] if we could work with you on it [INAUDIBLE].

MR. OAXACA: Dr. Jenkins.

DR. JENKINS: I just want to pick up on what Betty Vetter said about the wide variety of ways in which child care can be treated. In Prince George's County, in the Washington, D.C. area, they treat it by adding onto the school day of children, so they have what they call work-schools that start early in the morning and go late at night.

So when you talk about child care, you can talk about all the varieties available that [INAUDIBLE].

MS. EMERY: I think we're straying a little bit from the whole point. I think that you really want to focus in on the issue of, really, dependent care, but--we'll say child care--in that academic and post-graduate period for the woman, right?

I don't think you want to get involved with--I don't even think you want to get involved with the legislation on the Hill, as far as child care is concerned. There are like 100 bills being, you know, on the floor right now. I mean it's such a hot issue.

MS. SPALLEN: [INAUDIBLE] really what the legislation says, if so, as Nina Winkler advised us earlier, very forcefully in an earlier session...

MR. OAXACA: Forcefully, I can't believe that.

MS. SPALLEN: The way we word it is sufficiently general that we make our principle clear, that we are not tagging ourselves to any one approach over others, so that we don't sink or swim depending on what bill passes or doesn't.

MS. EMERY: All right, now which, what legislation are you referring to? Are you talking about parental leave or child care?

MS. SPALLEN: Well, we'll [INAUDIBLE] and talk to your office and see whether we've got, we're up to date. Apparently, we've got some stuff.

MS. EMERY: I think the most helpful document will be the Task Force report that the Secretary of Labor will be coming out with next week.

MS. SPALLEN: If you could supply that.

MS. EMERY: Yeah, be happy to.

MR. OAXACA: Dr. Brasel, I think you wanted to.

DR. BRASEL: Well, I just, one of the reasons I'm

dragging my feet about, you know, coming up with a, quote, new extensive recommendation, is, I think, has already come out.

Different localities have different needs in terms of child care and are going to be able to meet them, or should be meeting them in different ways.

And, although I share Mary's concern about saying we think it ought to be done and then not suggesting ways of implementing it because it gives people an out.

I don't know how we can come up with specific recommendations because they are just going to be almost as many as there are families that have kids to be taken care of, and would want to rather only emphasize that it is critically important to this whole issue of maintaining a work force is that we are going to have to do something that meets our responsibility vis a vis child care, and admit that there are many options, but that it cannot be ignored, and leave it at that.

MS. KEMNITZER: I really try to not weigh in on substantive points but take guidance from you all on what is in the report, but on this issue, I must say something. So please indulge me.

I am here because my husband took off vacation this week. We have heard eloquently from various witnesses about how they are on the brink, on the brink, because of this issue.

I also know of several excellent research pieces which say that girls do not choose science and technology

careers because they don't think that they can be a mother and a scientist and engineer.

It's crucial to our work force issue. We must say something strong about the importance of this and the responsibility of employers and all the institutions that are in the science enterprise to do something about it.

It's not a woman's problem. It's a national problem. I am not saying we should endorse legislation, but I'm saying it's crucial to the women in science and technology. Thank you.

MR. OAXACA: Ms. Joseph.

MS. JOSEPH: This is probably getting repetitive because that is along the lines that I was going to suggest, but you have gotten away from Ms. Jenkins' suggestion that you can do it in two parts, and one is that federal government as pacesetter. and you do have a beginning of a day care policy and some good examples of agencies who have done superbly and they are in the science and technology areas, as well, in terms of NASA and Labor, on the other side.

I think that this group has expertise to give a recommendation of the federal government as pacesetter, whether it is in the executive order or whatever, and then follow up with other employers and make the comment about the importance to exactly what you have said, not just the current people who are having problems, but the future of women making choices to go into these areas, based on the demands that are there

because of the inadequacies of child care from the university through the workplace.

And I think that two-parter would be strong enough and totally ignore whatever the existing bills are that are proposed, but as a national objective, not as a specific way of doing it.

MS. BISHOP: I'm just curious. How many federal agencies sitting around the table have day care centers? [pause] You may want to make a note of that, even in the report. Well, you know, there are what? Ten federal agencies, and maybe half of them.

?: There's 37 federal or...

MS. BISHOP: No, I meant the people represented on the work Task Force. I saw Defense, EPA, Agriculture, Labor, Education, and NASA.

MR. REYES: Now, in some places only.

MS. BISHOP: How many have day care centers on the premise as part of...

MS. FREEMAN: DOD has had various installations, some over 200 child care centers.

MR. OAXACA: Mary, we've covered the easy one. Now, I understood you had two more.

DR. CLUTTER: Yeah, I did the easy one first. OK, the other two things that came out of testimony yesterday that I feel were very, very significant were, there were a couple of women there who testified yesterday who are national leaders,

absolutely, Sheila Widnall and Mildred Dresselhaus, and I think everybody around the table has probably heard their names many, many times.

And those women have done a turnaround themselves on set-aside programs, because they were adamantly opposed to set-asides as recently as six months ago, and they have done a turnaround and think they are now necessary.

And they are faculty members, senior endowed chair professors at MIT. They are no slouches. MIT is one of the best of the nation's universities on women's issues, and they think that things are so bad that there really need to be set-aside programs.

They have come to that conclusion and I think that that's very significant. And I see [INAUDIBLE] is sort of chuckling there.

But I think that was very significant. I was profoundly moved by their testimony.

And finally.

DR. JENKINS: So that would mean that we would recommend both set-asides plus mainstreaming, correct?

DR. CLUTTER: Well, yes, I think that one of our recommendations--no, no, this is isn't the day care issue--this is set-aside programs for targeted groups.

MR. OAXACA: Let's--there's people who want to comment on that. Estella, first.

MS. GUERRA: I am a supporter of set-aside programs

and based only--and I've discussed this with OPM personnel, when it comes to education are the higher education, the pre-college and the research.

If we can compare the inroads that have been made by minorities and women in business, based on the set-asides, I think we would have a very good role model--good model to follow in some type of a set-aside program, because the number of businesses has increased tremendously but it's been based, I understand, on the set-asides that have encouraged people to go into enterprise.

MR. OAXACA: Joe was next, and then you, Nina.

DR. DANEK: From a personal point of view and some of the programs that we operate, I think it's also very important to make a statement that the recommendations for set-aside programs or target--I don't like the word set-aside, I think we have to deal with that.

MS. WINKLER: Joe just took the words out of my mouth.

DR. DANEK: OK, there is a concept that when you do a set-aside, you take a set-aside and you put it aside because the group that you're dealing with is not competitive and can't make it in the mainstream, and they're going to get that kind of money.

MS. FREEMAN: But if they're not discriminated against, and they haven't been...

DR. DANEK: But the perception is that, that that

group will not be competitive and therefore is going to take that money and spend it for 20 years or so.

I think if you do that, you have to first describe that this is incentive money for competitiveness, for developing competitiveness.

MR. OAXACA: Thank you, Ernie, for your help.

MR. REYES: I've been telling her, we've been trying to clean up the space center to get a [INAUDIBLE] center for decades.

DR. JENKINS: So I have to go back to Washington [laughter].

MR. REYES: She needs to go up and kick some butt to get [laughter], when I was there. We have a dire need, and you saw [INAUDIBLE] here, we have some of the same kind of young engineering, very good, etc., and we need to go catch the buck.

DR. JENKINS: Some NASAs are attempting to....

MR. REYES: That's all I have to say, then.

DR. JENKINS: Very good, thank you. OK, bye bye.

DR. DANEK: If you put the set-aside, which I recommend, I strongly urge that you phrase it in such a way that this money is incentive money for developing competitiveness in a particular area.

The second point that I--and I think there are ways of doing that. We've fought with that at NSF and I think we have come up with some very nice compromises and some programs.

I think there is another important thing that needs

to be stated in the report. It must be stated that national figures in science and engineering, women and men alike, support set-asides, because the biggest problem that we have had with some of our programs is we have had these set-aside programs, particularly for women and minorities, and we will get into a meeting with a group of women and a number of them will stand up and fight against those set-asides.

And that does tremendous damage, OK. People listen to that, the leaders at NSF and other places listen to that and then conclude that the leaders in science do not want set-asides and that it makes those individuals second class.

MR. OAXACA: Nina.

MS. WINKLER: Well, Joe, you had me for a minute there, but then you didn't. I think there is a substantive difference between set-asides and targeted grants.

From my perspective, we do a lot of contracting out in my office. I think we do $20 million this year in various studies and projects.

And there is this 8-A program, which I think is the worst of the set-asides, and that is not the model that we want. The problem with the 8-A is you have this 8-A guy who shows up whenever you are doing your contract planning.

MR. OAXACA: 8-A person.

MS. WINKLER: It's a guy in our case. And he just kind of picks out at random some project that you know there is only two or three companies that can do it right, and say, I'm

sorry, this one has got to be 8-A, which is just kind of crazy. It's not well thought out, it's--and it just causes resentment, and we fight it, which is crazy because 8-A should be something that is so easy that we would be delighted to go 8-A, because it's shorter and there is less hassle and less paperwork and so forth.

A targeted program of some sort can happen several ways. One thing is that in a competition you can provide points if you're coming from the targeted group, which means you still have to have all the basic technical credentials, but--that's one way.

There are other ways in which you can just--have a program that is specifically targeted to develop new--and that's money for that purpose and it doesn't come out of the regular, out of the regular pot.

And I think one of those two methods of having a targeting is much more effective, because you're not dragging the money out of a reluctant person's hands and throwing it at what they think is throwing it away.

Instead, you're giving someone basically free money to do something neat with, and maybe it is a little more experimental. I think you can--I'm not being very articulate, but do you get what I'm saying?

I think the money shouldn't be set aside out of a pot that's intended for other purposes, I guess.

MR. OAXACA: Larry.

DR. SCADDEN: OK, I think a lot of what Nina just said gets to the point that I want to make. I have never liked the term set-aside. I don't like quotas, but the only way we are going to be able to develop the kind of career and competitiveness among the population as we are aiming at is to create programs which are targeted--and that's what I was going to call them is targeted.

Perhaps it's targeted career development awards. One of the things that has been mentioned--Nina mentioned--is special points. As long as people as competitive--this is at least as far as research awards--as long as people have a minimum score to show they have some capability, then there could be additional points given that they are or they employ people who are among these groups.

But I do believe that we have to have specialized funds that fall into the area of targeted career development caches.

Similarly, as long as I'm talking, we have referred to the ROTC-like programs. I like the concept, I don't like the term.

?: Neither do we.

DR. SCADDEN: Yeah. Again, it is something where it is an agency-based--I even have a problem with scholarship because a scholarship would connote to me that you go through your training program and then you are free.

I would like--I think the reason why the ROTC-like

program appeals to a lot of us is the fact that this would give the agencies some claim to the individual for a minimum amount of time, unless they want to pay the funds back in the future.

But again, I would think this is a career development program targeted to a particular population.

MR. OAXACA: Stephanie.

MS. LEE-MILLER: Set-aside may be a phrase that people don't like, but it does work. In my experience, I have set-aside programs, through the 8-A program, for example, contributed significantly to the numbers of women and minorities that went into business, for example.

So whether we call it earmarking, set-aside, targeting, I think we should have a strong statement that a pot of money should be defined for the express purpose of increasing the numbers of women, minorities, and handicapped in the fields of science and technology.

The set-aside language has emotional baggage with it, but it is a concept that the governors understand and the localities, and I think I would be in favor of using that phraseology.

MR. OAXACA: Miss Freeman.

MS. FREEMAN: I would like to tag on a bit to Stephanie's statement and respond to Nina's comments. And that is, the concepts of targeting or set-asides, 8-A, whatever you want to call them, are similar.

The problem is in the management of those kinds of

programs. My experience with the programs has been positive, that when I managed 8-A programs or set-aside programs, we in fact did have a very competitive technically-based set-aside program. That is, the 8-A companies had to compete amongst themselves and prove their technological capabilities.

Managers have to be accountable and take responsibility for assuring that these programs, in fact, meet the goals of the stated project, or--don't blame it on the program, blame it on the managers who are not effectively carrying out the Congressional mandates.

MR. OAXACA: Thank you. The last thing on that. Then we'll go to Mary for her third easy topic. Joe, and then-oh, one last one was.

MS. MEJIA-WALGREEN: I haven't talked too much, Mr. Chairman, but I wrote down what I want to say. And I hear us discussing some very substantive issues and things that we need to discuss because they are at the heart of what we are all about.

But we're putting together a third draft, an interim report, that we want to disseminate, and unless we entitle that interim report, "Discussions of the Task Force on Women, Minorities and the Disabled," I really think we're pushing.

We still seem to lack a consensus on a lot of very substantive issues, and I know that Ernie brought it up because it was brought up in our discussion, but I really would urge us to reconsider what type of an interim report we are going to

try to put out when we are still in the midst of such discussion.

MS. BISHOP: Maybe we are not ready for that stuff yet.

MS. MEJIA-WALGREEN: Maybe that's what I'm trying to say.

MR. OAXACA: Well, it's conceptually--I think you will miss the window of opportunity if you don't come out bold and strong and call it....

MS. BISHOP: No, no, that's not what I hear her saying. I totally agree with--as I call it, call a spade a spade...

MR. OAXACA: You can do that, I can't.

MS. BISHOP: But you know what I mean. I'm saying not beat around the bush, and I agree with what you're saying. I think what her comment is, is timing. Yes, we're going to come out with a bold report, but the question is, is this the report that you're ready to come out with this bold report?

MR. OAXACA: Well, I don't think we have any intent, no.

MS. FREEMAN: Or should it be [INAUDIBLE].

MS. BISHOP: Or should it, or should we...

MR. OAXACA: There's nothing sacred about May, it could be June. You know, if it takes another month, and it looks like it might, we'll do it that way. And I don't...

MS. FREEMAN: Oh, and the title, maybe we should call

it, "Discussions," "Interim Report on the Discussions of the Task Force."

MR. OAXACA: Well, "discussions" doesn't set up an agenda, a national agenda for the politicians.

MS. MEJIA-WALGREEN: I realize it doesn't, but this is what we're still doing. We're still in the midst of discussions.

DR. JENKINS: May I just say something? I think there are key issues on which we all are not going to agree. But I think we are closer to consensus than we may...

MR. OAXACA: Yes, I agree, I agree.

DR. JENKINS: I think this last discussion, for instance, was what the language, which kind of language carries baggage? And how to use language that says what we wanted to say without the baggage, if we can study enough to do that.

MR. OAXACA: OK, I agree.

DR. JENKINS: So I really--it seems to me this morning, we've been building consensus around [INAUDIBLE]

MR. OAXACA: Estella.

MS. GUERRA: The one thing that as a Task Force, or as a group putting out an interim report, we must be very much aware of this effect that we don't want this interim report to lose whatever interest or not create an interest for the final report, because I think this interim will either make us or break us.

It could come out as something that people see as the final--what else could be there? Or we will lose the momentum, or we will lose the interest, or whatever. But I think the timing has to be right, and not only that, but the issues as they are.

It's almost like more to come.

MR. OAXACA: Harriett.

DR. JENKINS: I keep hearing interim report now. Are we putting out an interim report or are we putting out a report which we want the federal agencies, particularly, to move on.

MR. OAXACA: Well, it's a three-year Task Force.

DR. JENKINS: I understand that.

MR. OAXACA: You may want to call it phase one or something, I don't know. But what do you call--the idea being that right now is an ideal time to come up with substantive recommendations before the politicians all do their number.

DR. JENKINS: I agree with that, but...

MR. OAXACA: Everybody's out there on the stump.

DR. JENKINS: I heard the term "interim report," and I'm not sure many federal agencies would go off and move on what you call an interim report. We have to be pretty positive about what it is we're recommending and at whatever phase we go out on the street with whatever...

MR. OAXACA: Sure, I understand. Deborah.

MS. SPALLEN: Yeah, well, let me just point out. I don't think, regarding set-asides, there's some basic, very

basic issues that I don't think the group, that I think the group needs to discuss.

I think it's clear, from what I've been listening to over the last several months, that the people in this group, in general, will go for set-asides to some extent, because they are to some extent useful and proven and to the extent that that is credible, no matter what you call it or how you choose to characterize what it is that you prefer to do.

But beyond that, there are many very much more important issues. One is, what do we do with the mainstreaming? How do you make federal agencies more accountable in ways that mainstream money reaches these people. We know that one of our subcommittees made valiant efforts to try and figure this out, and was essentially unable to do so, except in the case of a couple of agencies.

Now, the third issue, which interlocks. They all relate to each other. Number one, set-asides, number two, mainstream, and mainstream [INAUDIBLE] the set-asides, and what you want to do with mainstream programs.

The third key is, in view of the fact that the key part of the pipeline to the future work force is the universities, and that's where, as you heard yesterday, a lot of women and minorities get off the track.

What role do we, as a group, [INAUDIBLE] from universities, in their accountability and the way that they spend these funds?

Now, I just want to pass along to you--if Howard were here, he would have done so. He and I talked it extensively yesterday--Howard Adams--and the issue is, to what extent do we want to make universities accountable?

And what extent do we want to make the federal R&D granting agencies accountable? And how those two pieces of accountability relate to each other.

And Howard suggested yesterday that, with respect to federal R&D funds that we have language, which I will try to read, although I can barely read my handwriting and I can barely talk.

MS. KEMNITZER: Deborah, can I please ask that we try to incorporate that in the next draft and show it to people, because I would very much like to get on with the other subcommittees while we have them here.

MS. SPALLEN: Right, I agree, but the point is that if the issue is not simply what to call set-asides. The issue is the relationship between set-asides and billions worth of mainstream money.

MR. OAXACA: OK.

DR. CLUTTER: Well, actually Deborah has given a good introduction to my third point.

MR. OAXACA: Good, because we've got to get on to the Blacks committee.

DR. CLUTTER: Exactly, exactly. Let me just say that the research subcommittee had a recommendation that said

something like all of the special programs, the target programs that exist today should be evaluated, as well as the mainstream programs, for their effectiveness in dealing with the problems that we all seek [INAUDIBLE].

And I strongly recommend that we keep that recommendation in the report.

OK, my third and final point...

DR. JENKINS: I'm not sure I like it, I'm not sure I understand it, but let's not take the time now. I'll talk to you, Mary, go ahead.

DR. CLUTTER: Well, it was one of your recommendations. [Several inaudible comments].

DR. JENKINS: OK, go on to your third point.

DR. CLUTTER: OK, the third point has to do with leadership. And Shirley McBay yesterday addressed the very point that Deborah brought up, and that is that universities have to be held accountable for this, as well as the federal government.

And Shirley said that they had made a recommendation, her [INAUDIBLE] committee, had made a recommendation that the 10 universities that received most federal R&D funds, the presidents of those universities ought to meet with the heads of agencies to talk about what they are going to do, and how they are going to be accountable for what needs to be done for women, minorities, and the disabled.

DR. DANEK: But Mary, are you saying...?

DR. CLUTTER: And I would recommend--and I think that that was a very good recommendation, and in fact, whether or not this group wants to endorse that, I'm going to do it.

DR. DANEK: But the point is, what you're raising even further is that, that could be expanded so then you cover the major contractors, in other words, the top 10 of every federal agency, not just NSF.

MS. BISHOP: That's our commission.

DR. CLUTTER: No, no, I meant the top 10 federal agencies and the top 10...

DR. DANEK: And their top 10 contractors, whatever they may be.

MS. BISHOP: That would be like DOD and HHS and...

DR. DANEK: Right, right.

MS. BISHOP: That's our commission.

DR. DANEK: That's part of it.

MS. BISHOP: That's part of the commission.

MR. OAXACA: Ferial or Jim, do either of you have an airport problem? Or shall we go on...

MS. BISHOP: No, my plane leaves at 2:30.

MR. OAXACA: Oh, OK, well, and what about yours?

MR. BIAGLOW: 4:30.

MR. OAXACA: Oh, OK. So why don't we--are we done now? We can switch over to Blacks. Otherwise we will never get...

DR. SCADDEN: Could I, could I?

MR. OAXACA: Larry.

DR. SCADDEN: Could I just say that even though they do not have plane problems, I do, and I would like to be here for the discussion of the disability target group, and...

MR. OAXACA: OK, then let's, with your kind indulgence, Ferial, we'll switch over to Jim, your committee. Thank you, Mary. Always glad to handle the non-controversial stuff.

MR. BIAGLOW: The disabled committee--get the mike here.

DR. SCADDEN: It wasn't a disabled committee. [laughter].

MR. BIAGLOW: Three-quarters of it was--had a very successful meeting yesterday for approximately two and a half to three hours, including Patricia Smith from the Department of Education, Lawrence "Sunshine" Scadden, and Alan Clive.

We came up, oh, we think are at least seven positive recommendations. With your tolerance, I'll go through them.

The first one was really a hint from Joseph Danek on establishment of alliances with federal and state rehabilitation counselors or directors, along with independent living centers and the National Science Foundation to identify an award of up to 150 scientific scholarships to the nation's most talented disabled students.

The objective of the awards would be to call attention to and stimulate the development of disabled as full

partners in the scientific community.

The second recommendation was to combine the handicapped affirmative action plan with the EEOC affirmative action plan for other minorities. Don't make the disabled a special case in treatment as far as minorities go. Treat them along with the Blacks, the Hispanics, the American Indians.

This would enable federal agencies, instead of coming up [INAUDIBLE] to set goals for the next five years, a specific number. If they don't seek disabled scientists, disabled engineers, they don't set a goal for them, they aren't going to look for them.

This would enable them to at least start looking for them.

Number three was to provide technology among training programs and pre-college programs, so that the disabled may acquire the expertise needed to compete in the scientific community.

Examples would be some of the math campuses, math fairs, scientific fairs, that are conducted throughout the country. Very few of those have any disabled participation, participants whatsoever.

Our fourth recommendation, to develop, or as a response to developing a media campaign to raise the social consciousness of the parents of the disabled, the disabled youth themselves, counselors, and employers to the potential of the disabled for entering the scientific community.

Currently today, it was felt that many disabled persons, the youths and even the counselors themselves, they are not recommended as being scientists. They are not pushed to [INAUDIBLE] at all.

Our fifth recommendation, which the IRS would love, is to revise the tax codes so that the employers and disabled individuals may have the additional purchasing power needed to obtain the equipment to pursue scientific careers.

Number six was to direct the Office of Special Education to work with rehabilitation centers to establish priorities for development of programs that would enable the disabled to seriously consider science as a career.

This in particular would be orientated toward the disabled youth, those that had not developed earning patterns, had not developed their education as of yet, the [INAUDIBLE] youth who have no prejudice one way or another, have not formed ideas and concepts of the world. I think [INAUDIBLE] might want to have some extra comments on that.

Our seventh recommendation was to develop the current disabled advisory groups into exemplary examples for aiding the disabled in the pursuit of a scientific career.

This would focus on the major federal scientific agencies--NASA, National Science Foundation, Department of Energy, National Bureau of Mines, etc. There would be not only an agency, but interagency and quasiagency support group.

And I think we concluded with seven very sound, very

practical recommendations.

MR. OAXACA: And, Jim, one of the things that struck me as a very key input yesterday was the one from the professor in mathematics that said we must raise the water table.

I don't get the feeling in having attended a lot of schools and been in the trenches for a long time that the general educational community views the requirement for capital equipment at the pre-K through 12 level as being something that should be there and taken for granted, as opposed to capital equipment that's brought in because you have some kid that's disabled and all of a sudden asks for something.

He may not know to ask for it. Therefore, there is not real mechanism in there unless there is a proactive move by the child or by the child's parents to demand that that capital equipment be there, that takes into account the thing that was so graphically displayed to us yesterday, that technology can make one heck of a difference with those kids at the formative stages.

Did you folks in your group address the issue of what the nation must be prepared to spend as an investment in capital equipment so that the young kids have that wherewithal to initially jump in, taking advantage of these technologies, where indeed the cost of processing equipment is dropping every year to year and a half by half.

MR. BIAGLOW: We did not specifically address that yesterday. However, in some of the local groups in the Ohio

area, we have addressed such a problem.

The sources for any kind of living in Ohio have secured through government aid and in grants sufficient equipment which they are provided at math camps, scientific affairs. They have the tie-ins with the counselors. They have--they are the Presidents and Vice Presidents and secretaries of the paraplegic organization. This is Saturday we were worrying.

They know who the disabled are in the state. They know the requirements of the disabled in the state. They move around specific equipment at a very nominal fee.

We're not talking about every science fair, every math fair that is held in every city throughout the country. That would be an enormous amount of investment. At the same time, it would substantially bring down the cost of each individual unit, more or less we're talking about 1,000 units costing $10,000, I think you'll agree that 10,000 units would cost even half of that, and 100,000, even half again.

It opens the [INAUDIBLE] compactness of the computer, keeps on going smaller, with more memory than we've ever seen before.

MR. OAXACA: See, I would think that our report somehow has to treat that, because I think, based on the testimony I heard, and I was absolutely ignorant about the unique problems faced, without that equipment on-site on day one in whatever school in America you're talking about, those

kids are really swimming uphill.

DR. SCADDEN: Well, those data can be generated without a tremendous amount of problem, as long as we can generate the numbers as to how many people we're dealing with, and Nina tells me that's [INAUDIBLE] will have to find out.

MS. WINKLER: I'm sorry?

DR. SCADDEN: It's difficult to find out how many disabled kids we're really discussing in the United States.

MS. SMITH: Actually, no, it's not, that's not hard. No, we have the report. One of my notes was, when I meet with Sue is that we have the report to Congress, we know the number of students who are in all the different categories who have handicapping conditions, and as far as students in school and the equipment that they need, there are still, of course, financial constraints and problems across the country to provide what each and every student needs.

But the way that the federal mandated law for the education of all handicapped children is stated, is that if a child has the need, that that--you know, whatever they need to get to the place that they have to be for their education, it will be a part of their individualized plan in order for them to be educated.

One of the things that I have learned from being here and one of my thoughts that I have had in this period of time in preparing for this meeting is that there needs to be a concerted push after this report is completed to get this

information into the hands of the counselors and the parents and the educators that are working with these students, because one of my just observations is that there is not a high enough level of expectation.

Or it's again the deflecting of students that, well, you have a handicapping condition, probably you wouldn't want to go into science. I mean just that whole, you know, I mean there is just a whole lot of that attitudinal thing that has deflected, and I think Larry, some of his comments, as to how people get to be where they are has a lot to do with the leadership in this country as to what the expectations are.

And we have a lot of self-fulfilling prophecies around that do not get us to the point that we would want our students to be.

So I think part of it is a point of educating those who are educating people, and, Jim, just a little comment on the six recommendations. It is not only that I want recommended that we work with our office through our rehabilitation unit, but also the NIDR, the National Institute on Rehabilitation Research, Disability Research, and also into OSEP, which is the Office of Special Education, because we put out about six million--no, more than that, I can't give you the exact number--we put a lot of money into personnel preparation.

One of the places that we need to impact is in training of teachers to raise these expectations, to guide students in this direction.

And these are things that we could impact on by encouraging that priorities be established in all three of the component areas of special education and rehab in order to get that work to flow, and that's very doable.

In fact, I can begin working on that immediately. It will take a period of time for that to happen, but it is very doable to get that particular piece of information into our agency and eventually it will hit the priorities, and that's what we need to have it do.

DR. SCADDEN: The other important part--another important part, at least, of this whole cost effectiveness issue is the fact that we are seeing and we will continue to see more and more microcomputers in the elementary schools.

And as we reach towards the [INAUDIBLE] one-to-one, microcomputers to kid, and we are getting closer and closer to that in many, many school districts, that has a lot of positive impact upon the education of disabled students, because with a microcomputer, assuming it's the right one--and don't get some off funny brand operating system--but if it's the IBM type or the Apple type, with very minimum amount of additional funding, the peripherals can be added to those units to make them accessible to alternative input and output, as may be needed.

So, Jaime, we can generate those numbers, and I will be glad to work with Patty or with whomever to come up with the numbers for the report.

MR. OAXACA: Alan.

DR. CLIVE: I wanted, Jim, to add onto, I believe it was the sixth recommendation, has to do with the consciousness raising, because I was struck by something that Mary Clutter said, and then Patty has said about half of what I wanted to say, what has to do with the raising of expectations.

But Mary Clutter, when those agency heads meet with their top 10 contractors, I would bet you because of the size of the college we were talking about, they were almost all going to have schools of social work attached to them.

And there is something profoundly wrong going on in America's social work schools, because that, I gather, is where we get most of our voc rehab counselors from. They are the people who are helping to generate these low expectations.

And I have seen some good ones in my work, but I have also seen a lot of awfully bad ones, and I have heard a lot of awful stories about what happens to students who try to fight the system, to meet goals that they know they can attain, but that their counselors insist that they cannot.

So, if it is possible to include something in our recommendation, or maybe even another recommendation, to hold schools of social work accountable for approaching us from the standpoint of maximizing our potential.

When a counselor--wasn't it a counselor, Larry, who told you you ought to be in a bending stand?

DR. SCADDEN: That's correct--rehab counselor, yeah.

DR. CLIVE: I was lucky because I lost my vision

after I had started my educational career, and I told my counselor I wanted to be a professional historian, and she said, that was fine with her, and I never had any trouble from the state of Michigan. But I seem to be in something of a minority.

So I just want to make sure that we pay attention, and indeed, Mary, when those meetings are held--because I understood, you say you're going to hold them regardless of what we do or not?

DR. CLUTTER: Oh, yeah, oh, yeah.

DR. CLIVE: Please make sure that that get's published.

MR. OAXACA: Larry.

DR. SCADDEN: The reason I wanted to have this discussion prior to my departure was that there were a couple of points I wanted to make on the whole topic of the disability issue.

For the last two meetings, in California and Atlanta, our leadership has been putting the arm on me to get additional speakers and to really bring this Task Force some additional information regarding the situation of recruiting and training people who are disabled in the area of science and engineering.

So I would like, if I may, to just take a couple of minutes I need to cover a couple of points that still have not, has not come out in the testimony.

One has to do--well, the main thing has to do with

intervention, but just to quickly, one thing on demographics and one thing on nomenclature in the report.

We have fought among ourselves, the subgroup, and as members of the Task Force on how to refer to this population, handicapped or disabled. The accepted term is "people with disabilities."

It becomes cumbersome to use it all the time. For that reason, I don't care very often what it's called, but I think to--in the introductory period, piece, or the table of contents, when we talk about definitions, I think we should use the term "people with disabilities."

Whether we talk about disabled students or disabled people in other places, you're not going to bother me. But just to say "the disabled," that will get us in trouble, if we use that term by itself as often as it occurs in the report.

I was outvoted in our group last night, three to one, on the issue of terminology. All of my staff get on me for using literary license [INAUDIBLE] use the term "cosmic role of the dice." I enjoyed it, but my colleagues don't, and that might get us in trouble if we--that is obviously the case when we see how many people are disabled because of automobile accidents or war. I don't really consider that a cosmic role of the dice. It's an unfortunate circumstance that we live with in our civilization, or lack of it at times.

So something of that kind maybe needs to be changed.

On demographics, we have, thanks to Jim's work, NASA

has paid for a lot of demographic gathering, and I am pleased with the data that he brought yesterday, and I think we can cut back on the number of times we say in the report we need more data on disabled populations.

We have more than we probably recognize we have, but let's try to push priorities of action that are probably, I would say are very definitely more important than just data gathering. We have more data than we, than I even recognized before.

Now, the topic of intervention. This is something that I have been saying for a couple of months to this group, that I say in a mass group now.

Intervention strategies to encourage, to recruit and train people with disabilities in the field of science and engineering, the intervention strategies are very similar. They are basically identical to those strategies that we have heard so much about for women, Blacks and Hispanics.

We haven't heard too much about Native Americans, so it's difficult to know if they are identical. But I think there will be similarities.

But the problem is we have had very few of these intervention strategy examples in the United States--summer programs, mentor programs, weekend programs, and the like. The few that have been identified are good. What we need to do is replicate them in more locations. Rather than looking for more, let's replicate the ones we know that work.

And in Baltimore we will hear more about, at least three programs that I have invited people to come and testify.

So I don't want people to go away thinking that we need tremendously different programs for disabled people. What we need are similar programs. We need to make sure that there is access to the science programs in junior high and high school and college.

Mainstreaming, as I have said to some people, has been a tremendous thing, but at the same time, many school districts have got around it by saying, "We will waive these classes that will be too difficult for these disabled students. They don't have to take science."

I say, let's force them to take science. That the only way to make sure they have an equal experience is to ensure that they have access to the activities. That often means the inclusion of the specialized technology, and it doesn't have to be expensive when it's technology that will give them the experiences.

One last comment, Jaime, and then I'll be quiet.

MR. OAXACA: Lots of time.

DR. SCADDEN: We have talked many times within small groups. Are we talking about scientists and engineers, or does the spectrum of activity go into the technical fields as well.

If it is strictly scientists and engineers, then we're talking about disabled people who have physical, sensory, and cognitive impairments, rather than mental retardation.

But if we are going to increase the continuum of technical activities to include technicians, it most certainly does include many people who have mental retardation and developmental disabilities.

So, I gave Deborah my view on this a few weeks ago. It is--she reflected it perfectly, and then I find out that we are including more technical version--technical professions, vocations, so the definition is broader than it was before.

So, I think we need to be more specific in what we are referring to as far as the spectrum of activities, and then the, be careful on how we define disability.

But I will be happy to work with you, Deborah, and once I get back to my computer I will take this second report and do a lot of referencing as well.

MR. OAXACA: Thank you, Larry. Barbara Morgan.

MS. MORGAN: I just want to underscore something that Larry said. When I read this report, the first thing I underlined in red ink was the...

MR. OAXACA: Could you speak up a little bit, Barbara, please?

MS. MORGAN: Yeah, I just want to underscore something that Larry said. When I first read this report, the first red flag that came out to me was this sentence about not including mentally retarded, because I think this Task Force, one, if we are to be role models ourselves, we shouldn't be discriminatory.

And two, something that came up over and over again in the testimony that we have had so far is the need for general science literacy, not just technicians, but general science literacy across this country, and that also includes people who do have abilities to learn, albeit at limited levels.

MR. OAXACA: Thank you. Any other comments on people with disabilities?

DR. FINNEY: I was interested in number five, your types, what specific ones do you have in mind?

DR. SCADDEN: Well, that's the IRS code. That's my--I guess I should address that.

It's come up many times. I work for industry, so that's my bias, that very often industry has made a--companies have made the statement that if they had some tax breaks on buying equipment necessary for disabled scientists, that they would be more willing to hire people.

But the other side of the issue, and I consider it to be far more important, is that the disabled scientist, or other worker, if that individual can go into the workplace with the technology necessary to make him or her fully competitive, there is a much higher chance that that person will be employed.

It's a very--it can be a very expensive proposition, and I strongly believe that manipulation of the tax code to allow the individual to write some of that stuff off will

certainly provide a much higher level of competitiveness.

But the fact that companies, as somebody quoted some data yesterday, I think it was Elmer Bartels, that a company can write off something like--or deduct $35,000 worth of architectural barriers to enable a disabled person to have access to the workplace.

But right now that same company can't write off the equipment necessary to make that person productive and competitive.

So right now there is legislation. It will be introduced next week in the Senate that will address that, but I decided to throw it in anyway in my recommendation.

DR. VETTER: The individual can already write it off, can't he?

DR. SCADDEN: No, they could until this year. Our great new tax law has destroyed [INAUDIBLE].

DR. VETTER: All of that [INAUDIBLE], oh my.

DR. SCADDEN: I have been writing it off for 20 years, and now it has to be 2 percent of my gross income.

MR. OAXACA: Alan.

DR. CLIVE: Well, of course, and I don't--like the scanner that we say today would certainly cost that 2 percent threshold for many people, but I think it's important for people to understand why we would want something like this for individuals, and that it does not necessarily have to be work-related.

There is a continuum of ways that a disabled person can get things done. In my case, if I want to take a report home and read it, which is an activity that all of you have done. Well, how do I do it? Get my wife to do it? No way! Not with two kids to have to deal with.

Get a volunteer reader? OK, but that's the night that he or she is sick. Use an Opticon? Well, I could, but I have got tendonitis in my wrists and I just don't have the speed. Get a Kurzweil scanner? OK, fine. That's the solution, but that's 10 or 12 thousand dollars.

And I'm not going to be able to do that if I cannot get some kind of tax benefit for it.

Now the problem--the other problem with the tax laws right now is, that in many cases, you can only write this stuff off if you can get a letter from your employer saying that it is at the employer's convenience.

And here we run into a flat issue of disparate treatment, because you folks who concede you don't need your employer's word of approval to take that report home, because all you have to do is look at it.

Why should I have to have a letter of approval from my employer for something that enables me to do what you do just as a matter of course?

And then there is the other issue which is the independence, because of course I want to use that scanner for other things, just as I paid for this item, which, thank God,

is relatively inexpensive. I paid for this out of my own pocket, so that I could be free to use it for personal things.

I want to be able to use that Kurzweil scanner to read letters, to do all kinds of stuff, and I believe that there ought to be a national commitment toward increasing the independence of disabled people.

And I'm not suggesting that as yet another diversionary issue to throw into the report, but I want to say that I think that is what the tax code ought to be about in the case of our group, helping us to increase our independence.

MR. OAXACA: Thank you, Jim. We will now go to the final report from Ms. Bishop on Blacks.

MS. BISHOP: Our committee met over several hours, and I would like to indicate who our committee members were: Claire Freeman, Harriett Jenkins, Joe Danek, Stephanie Miller, Nina Winkler, Shirley Malcom during the time that she was here, and Essex Finney, and myself.

And each of us has comments, and we agreed that we would do it on an individual basis, so we did not come up with a one document with all of the comments in it.

We focused our comments in two parts, one being overall comments on the document itself, and the second part we focused in on the recommendations.

And the reason we did that was that we believe that most readers of the document would do the same thing, focus in on the specific recommendations.

Overall, the committee felt that the report needed to be tightened, documented by answers and solutions, and totally concentrate on recommendations and doable action plans.

In terms of percentages, we felt 20 percent words, narrative, 80 percent action, recommendations, action plan.

We found that a lot of recommendations were buried in the document and we found ourselves talking about the recommendations in the summary and whether or not it adequately covered certain items, only to have it brought to our attention that that was spelled out in the content of the document on page 31 or 45 or 62.

So we are extremely--really felt strongly that we needed to put all of our recommendations in one place, so that from that we could either talk in terms of priority and then from that develop doable action plans, which we believe is possible.

We felt that the title, that we needed to do a more creative title. "Who Will Do Science?" just doesn't do it, and we felt that there is enough creative people on the Task Force that we could come up with our own title.

I will offer one that only two of the members have seen, because I thought about it at two o'clock this morning, and I will give you a suggested title because--and the title, the suggested title is, "Science and Technology: A Diminishing Commodity."

So, leave that with you. It's negative, but again,

that's the way it is right now. We are in a negative situation. So that's why I said it's a diminishing commodity.

When we write our recommendations we felt that it should be--each recommendation should be preceded with a statement or a rationale--someone else [INAUDIBLE].

In the recommendations as currently written in the document, we find that the recommendations are buried, or they are at the bottom, and you talk about goals, and you get into a lot of [INAUDIBLE] and a lot of background.

So what we felt is that, in terms of formatting, that the recommendations, each one should be preceded by at least a paragraph or two which talks about why, what are the conditions, why do we feel the way we felt, or feel, which would lead us into stating the conclusion or the recommendation, that would give the reader a sense of why we feel there is an urgency at that time.

We believe that there should be some appendices, one of which should summarize the innovative programs that we've heard at these hearings.

We believe that a one paragraph, which talks about some of the sample innovative programs around the country, with names of contacts, should also be included in the appendix. Again, we want this document not to go on the shelf, but we want our superintendents of school systems and boards of directors and industry officials and everyone else to read the document.

And to the extent that we don't have to reinvent the wheel would be the reason why we want some of these programs highlighted in our appendix.

The document, again, I mentioned earlier, does not support a buy-in. I still find myself as, quote, if I were a leader, "Why should I support this? Why should it be important for me to spend more money or to reprogram monies in order to make a difference in the year 2000?"

One way in which we think we can do that would be, A) to separate introduction from recommendations, and in that introduction, which talks about the purpose, why we are all sitting in this room, the background which led to that legislation, although I understand there's no legislative history as to why we are here.

But it should be in the introduction which talks about what our charge is, why we are doing what we are doing, what's the background, and why is it so important for us to concentrate on women, minorities, and the handicapped in science and technology, and what are the consequences if we don't do what we are about to recommend on the following pages.

And in that place perhaps we can try to talk about why it's good for the American public to buy into our recommendations.

And that's what I think is really missing.

We need to point in there things about references and data tables. If we can come to a fact, it would be easy for

the reader to look at the related data tables to convince him that he should buy in and agree with our conclusion on the set of tables.

Deborah talked about data tables on the left side. I still think we ought to continue to move in that direction.

Someone yesterday--I think it was Claire--someone mentioned the business about unemployment of Black males and Hispanic males.

Again, I cite that as another reason that we can include in the introduction as to why we should--the reader should heed our advice and take our recommendations seriously, because again, unemployment is high--over 50 percent now. What do you think it's going to look like in the year 2000?

And yet, it's these same people who should be available for work force by the year 2000.

The American Indians, Alaskan Natives, I think it was mentioned before that we need to expand that category.

We also feel very strongly that Blacks should be capitalized-initial cap--the initial word "B."

MR. OAXACA: Is that a financial statement you're making? Black should be capitalized.

DR. VETTER: Do you want to capitalize white, that's the main trouble?

MS. BISHOP: Yes.

DR. VETTER: That's terrible.

MS. FREEMAN: Yes, if that's the case, yes. It's a

matter of preference and Blacks, and the state of the art of the language, the dynamic of our language in this country, is that we use the word Black to talk about a subset of people. It is not a color, it is a subset of people.

That is the dynamic exception of continuation of how this language, how the use of the word has evolved since the 1960s.

So I think it's appropriate. It may not be appropriate for whites, because you don't use that as a subset, as a title for people.

But in America, when I say I'm--when we talk about Black, we are talking about a subset of people, not a color.

MS. SPALLEN: So what is the recommendation, that whites also be capitalized?

MS. FREEMAN: That's up to you. That's [comments and laughter].

MR. OAXACA: That's up to you white folk.

MS. FREEMAN: I don't know about your experience and the dynamic of the language as regards the use of white to specify a subset of people.

MS. SPALLEN: Excuse me, in government style, we've rejected that pretty thoroughly. [More simultaneous comments].

DR. DANEK: Excuse me, but as the only white male non-handicapped [laughter].

MR. OAXACA: And the non-handicapped is a personal opinion [laughter].

DR. DANEK: Just haven't discovered it yet [INAUDIBLE], I would vote to keep the white small, small w's.

DR. JENKINS: Let me just say, if you call what I think is the term "Black" really [INAUDIBLE] the term Negro [INAUDIBLE] capitalized Black, capital B not Black.

?: Whatever you want to do.

MS. LOPES: Let's [INAUDIBLE], why not? [laughter].

MS. BISHOP: I think we--in all seriousness, I think when we're talking about a group of people, as we are here, and Harriett is right. In the fifties or forties, it used to be Negro. We have now switched and it's the same connotation.

You are talking about a subset of people and we refer to ourselves as Black people, and therefore would like to capitalize it.

DR. JENKINS: I could have gone back earlier in history because some of you are too young. Prior to Negro, it was Colored, do you recall that?

?: Yes, and that was capitalized.

[INAUDIBLE comments]

MS. GUERRA: We use the term non-minority to mean not Hispanic, not Black, not anything. Non-minority is used much more than white.

DR. VETTER: Not by whites it isn't.

DR. DANEK: Well the other term that's used often is majority group members.

DR. VETTER: The other word [Several simultaneous

comments] white, non-Hispanic is--that one you can capitalize because it has a prefix before it.

DR. DANEK: What is, I mean, from the symbolic point of view, what is wrong with leaving white a small w?

SEVERAL VOICES: Nothing. Nothing. No problem.

MS. GUERRA: But for the sake of consistency, why not capitalize it?

DR. DANEK: Why are we talking about consistency here? [Several simultaneous comments]

MS. WINKLER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. OAXACA: Nina.

MS. WINKLER: I am a rather passionate believer in calling people what they want to be called, since I am pretty insistent on people calling me what I want to be called, and I think, and I agree the Black members of the group felt that they wanted an initial cap on Black, and I just don't see any reason for arguing with that. There's just no argument.

MR. OAXACA: I think it's [INAUDIBLE].

DR. JENKINS: By the way, the other point was, if you are going to build so much negative reaction to your report, that it's just not worth going through it. Just put the capital B on it. There are going to be people who [INAUDIBLE] going like this every time they read it, and it just isn't worth it.

MR. OAXACA: I think that's--you know, if people want capital letters.

?: Non-negotiable, let's move on to [laughter and comments].

MR. OAXACA: [INAUDIBLE] offend anybody, let's use a small letter for white, what the heck.

MS. BISHOP: Moving right along, I mentioned about separating introduction from recommendations.

We feel also very strongly, for the sake of the reader, that underlining should only be done once, and that should be done only with recommendations.

You notice throughout the document, certain things, certain statements are also highlighted. We feel that only recommendations, the recommendation should be underlined.

MR. OAXACA: Not action items?

MS. BISHOP: No, no. [Several other comments] Action items can follow from a recommendation. Action items talk about objectives, milestones, output, the product, and who is going to do it, and that doesn't have to be capitalized, but it is your bold faced, innovative, strong approach in terms of recommendations that should be outlined.

DR. DANEK: Ferial, you mean also outlining that in the text.

MS. BISHOP: I'm sorry, underline.

DR. DANEK: Underline in the text, too, as well as in the front.

MS. BISHOP: As long as it is the same. I don't mean a paraphrasing. If your recommendations, in my opinion, if you

are going to have it on page 1 and page 31, should be identical.

And if you are going to underline on page 1, you underline on page 31.

MS. SPALLEN: Let me say that if things go as planned [INAUDIBLE], the typesetter for the next round of the report will offer us several options. It's underlined here because our printer had no capacity to italicize.

And the typesetter will be able to make things either normal type or bold face or italics. So there are actually several.

MS. BISHOP: OK. Recommendations also, in our opinion, should be [INAUDIBLE] with action verbs.

?: [INAUDIBLE]

MS. BISHOP: In bullet form, with action verbs--implement, do, make, create, charge, you know, those wonderful forceful words.

Task Force members, we believe, should be listed in the appendix, or listed someplace.

There is this area in there that talks about exemplary retention programs. We feel that there needs to be some characterization of how one identifies exemplary programs.

You need to do more than just say, this is an exemplary program. What are the characteristics? Based on our hearing, or our conclusion, which led us to say that here are some sample exemplary programs, what are the characterizations

of that?

The concept of the need for universities to do extended outreach to the Black community, outreach in schools, churches, organizations, appears to be obscure. And what we want to do is to bring that out, make it more specific, more pointed, that there has to be--it hasn't already started, but certainly continue this need to have universities and other institutions of learning extend out into the Black community.

This also could apply to all the other groups around.

Now, since we focused primarily on the recommendations, we took the liberty and wrote some of the recommendations that I would like to read into the record.

We felt very strongly that there has got to be leadership at the top. That could be no other than the President. The President must set the tone, if we are about the business of trying to make an impact by the year 2000.

We recommend that the President issue an executive order, with a goal of dramatically increasing the numbers of Blacks in professions of science and technology, to include the following directives:

Mobilizing the nation to realize that the future of America is tied to the increase in numbers of Blacks in science and technology;

Establish a public/private commission, headed by a presidential appointee, that reports annually to the Congress, the President, the heads of the agencies, regarding scientific

needs and program activities;

Task the Secretary of Education with the responsibility of targeting federal funds to programs that have a proven rate of success in training Blacks in science and technology;

Provide--and we can quibble over this--provide one billion dollars over the next five years to be distributed to HBCUs with proven success records in achieving science and technology for Black students;

That all federal contractors--and someone asked me whether it's all--but all federal contractors and recipients of federal grants should demonstrate their success in contributing to increasing numbers of Blacks in science and technology through their training programs, research scholarships, internships, working with school programs, etc.;

That this public/private commission be composed of X members--16 came out of the air, but simply the following members--members in the following categories: HBCU presidents, Hispanic community officials, Native American officials, cabinet level designees, Congressional representation, representation from the governors of the states, industry leaders, educational leaders--which brings the point that you mentioned about--and from the representatives of the disabled.

MR. OAXACA: Ferial, excuse me. Did your committee address or consider what meaning this report would have to the [INAUDIBLE] in the system where they've poured money down a

rathole on programs that absolutely did not work?

MS. BISHOP: Yes, we talked about that...

MR. OAXACA: That probably is part of your buy-in thing, to be able to say, you know, we recognize that we've poured a lot of money down a rathole.

MS. BISHOP: That's right. I think that--true--I mean I want to finish reading this, but you're absolutely correct. We talked about it, that there is a lot of money that's already going into programs and you keep getting the same question.

If we're pouring money into program X, Y and Z, why are we sitting here talking about not being able to move people into science and technology? Something is wrong.

MR. OAXACA: That's right.

MS. BISHOP: Part of the problem is that the programs that we're putting money in are not working. So, perhaps we need to address that as part of our introduction into the buy-in.

MR. OAXACA: Yeah, exactly, because you're going to get that--the folks that don't want to do this are going to turn around and say, wait a minute, here we go, another darn commission that says pour money at the problem, and that isn't going to do it.

All those people will say, gee, you know, deficit reduction, etc., etc. You gotta be able to say, here are some programs that absolutely have not worked. Now, if that's going

to cause some fuss--or maybe you put down the generic falacies in those programs and say, this amount of money was spent on it. That has produced a negative result.

I think it's very key, since you're right at the heart of the issue, on the buy-in. I really subscribe to your buy-in theory. What is it that the Task Force can do to show all the folks that are going to have an ax to grind on paying for all this, to say, there is going to be some reallocation of the resources where it hasn't worked.

If you look at the Hispanic and the Black community numbers, they've gotten worse.

MS. BISHOP: One of the other things about this commission, one of the things that could be met in several items of responsibility. Certainly one of them would be to develop criteria to define standards of excellence, which again is setting the tone for the nation.

With regard to the second area, which is K through 12, we have--we are offering the following statement.

DR. JENKINS: Pre-K.

MS. BISHOP: Pre-K through 12. Increase educational achievement levels of Black students by providing federal, state and local funds to experiment on a holistic approach. That is, health, education, and welfare aimed at the total child development.

For those inner-city schools composed largely of Black students who are below national achievement levels,

Congress should create legislation which will provide federal funds either through targeted funds or block grants to states, municipalities, school systems, which will develop holistic approaches to raising the math and science educational achievement levels of Black students to national levels.

And to the extent necessary, using the existing programs that work, i.e., MESA, the Atlantic University Program, Detroit Program, etc.

These systems should be allowed to utilize and comingle federal, state, and local, and industry funds, without the usual regulatory restrictions. And they should be encouraged to seek industry funds.

Those industries that participate in this endeavor should be given tax breaks for participating in these alliances and for providing support to kids through pre-K through 12.

Congress should also provide teacher fellowships, and in this case, this was an example of where we talked about fellowships for teachers, only to realize that it was on the bottom of page 21 and on the top of page 22, which again needs to be moved forward and be a part of one recommendation.

The other part of that deals with the fact that we should be training teachers to create more culturally user-friendly classrooms and learning environments.

I want to defer to my friend, Claire, so that she can more adequately explain to you what we mean by "user-friendly environment."

MS. FREEMAN: First of all, I would like to ask, is there, is it necessary for me to go into detail to articulate what I mean by user-friendly? [pause]

Continue with your report.

MS. BISHOP: In order to prepare and entice individuals to be teachers in science and technology in inner-city schools, the federal government should provide scholarships...

MR. OAXACA: Excuse me, would you read that again, I missed what you said.

MS. BISHOP: The beginning?

MR. OAXACA: Yes. In order.

MS. BISHOP: In order to prepare and entice individuals to be teachers in science and technology in inner-city schools, the federal government should provide scholarships support to get undergraduate training, for the undergraduate training in science and technology, and then provide them with an incentive grant, which is over and above the base teacher's salary, to teach in those schools for a three to five year period.

MR. OAXACA: Excuse me. You know, in East L.A., we are now into the tough issue of security for teachers. It is becoming dangerous for teachers to be there, and we in the Hispanic community are finding out that parents of young people are telling their kids, you know, don't try to teach in that area because you'll end up getting shot or knifed or mugged or

raped.

And I was wondering if you have addressed that as an issue that is also in the Black neighborhoods. It surely is in the Hispanic neighborhoods.

MS. BISHOP: I would think it also applies to the Black neighborhoods, but the committee did not address the safety of teachers.

MS. FREEMAN: What we did talk, though, about, those incentives, those bonuses or other kind of enticements to go into the inner city as hazardous duty pay.

MR. OAXACA: Oh, OK.

MS. FREEMAN: Recognizing that it is an unusually stressful environment. And that's why you need special programs to get people to get their attention to even look at going, choosing those particular geographic locations to teach.

So we do recognize that it is hazardous, number one, and that we need special programs, not only to train teachers to teach in those kinds of environments and to create an environment that is conducive to learning.

But the security aspect would, takes people's other kinds of skills, really.

MS. LEE-MILLER: Can I make a suggestion, like back to our child care conversation. If we're going to have a section called "support systems needed" to help this whole situation when we address the issue, that we need child care in the equation, we also need a secure school environment, so that

teachers can feel and parents can feel a protected environment.

And I would recommend that we perhaps have a support systems category that includes items like this, because I think that's a very good point.

MR. OAXACA: That's a good idea.

DR. JENKINS: I want to get back to the issue, though, of the incentive grant. [INAUDIBLE] to concentrate on the educational needs. And let me tell you what we were thinking about.

We need teachers who will go in and try to figure out where the youngsters are, and what they need, and help the school system build what is going to be described as a good educational experience.

It may mean a longer day. It may mean their willingness to work with small groups of youngsters, to tutor them, to have Saturday classes, to take them on field trips.

The issue of the summer employment of the teacher, and she didn't get to finish reading the recommendations.

So we are saying there are additional educational demands on those teachers that will go into those schools, and that's why they are getting the incentive grant. We didn't focus on the security point.

?: It's a separate issue.

DR. JENKINS: Because that raises so many negatives that our schools, that are [INAUDIBLE] not necessary as a security issue. But they all have educational needs, and so

that's why...

MR. OAXACA: Does that gonna, you know--the thing I worry about, as a person that has seen it happen and read about it--I'm sure we all have. Did you discuss at all the NEA, which will take you on on anything that doesn't...

MS. WINKLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. DANEK: The way we got around it was rather than call it a salary supplement, right, what we're saying is that this is a supplemental grant to assist the teacher to do a better job of teaching that wouldn't amount to [INAUDIBLE] thousand dollars a year.

?: No, I don't agree with that.

MS. FREEMAN: And, if you're getting...

DR. DANEK: And it would include summer salary, however.

MS. FREEMAN: If you're talking scholarship and intern, you're talking about people going, being prepared to go into teaching and getting experimental exposure prior to their final assignment.

So they may not even be union members yet.

DR. JENKINS: Would you like--perhaps we could finish the range of what that teacher is going to do, if it's there. Well, let her finish saying what the teacher would do for this incentive grant.

MS. BISHOP: The incentive grant is designed to augment summer salaries, to improve teaching skills, to develop

teaching curricula, to understand and obtain effective teaching methods for culturally different students in order to support the need for longer school day student enrichment and tutoring needs, field trips, and other efforts, which will and should contribute to a demonstrated, improved student achievement in science and technology.

Again, we're focusing on the educational level. We want to increase the achievement level of students in the inner cities in science and technology, and that's why we focus primarily on the whole area of educational, as opposed to security.

I agree with Stephanie, because we also talked about a category of support systems, to support the need of the student, in terms of teacher salaries, in terms of, now, you're bringing up security measures for inner-city schools, and I think that day care is another one.

That all should go under the umbrella of support systems.

DR. JENKINS: Excuse me, I wanted you to finish the whole thing, but Nina wanted to make a point about the salary, I think.

MS. WINKLER: The point you made about the NEA and the AFT was the point I raised last night. I feel that the recommendation that has been presented is a compilation of all the ideas that were discussed last night and are not necessarily a distillation of a consensus, because I don't

agree with all the pieces, and I do agree with some of the pieces, and I don't know whether we will want to really tear into it, but I can.

I guess one particular one was where this money would go to. My view was that--it was a much more limited view--I don't think it is appropriate federal role for the federal government to fund teachers' salaries in the public schools. It is just not an appropriate federal role, and there's a lot of reasons for it.

There is a traditional federal role of special aid in disadvantaged areas in schools, and certainly assisting in the development of teachers, particularly minority teachers going into minority areas of high poverty is a very appropriate kind of thing that the federal government has done in the past, and it can be developed in this case, too.

We talked about what do you do after the kid gets out of school and is teaching. Then what do we do for that person?

Several people there, including me, said, well, if you, if money is a problem and you want the federal government to kick in--and these are math and science teachers we're talking about--you may be able to do some sort of a sign-on bonus, just like you would for a consulting firm or investment bank or something, with the idea being that there are, that's an incentive to get in and maybe there are additional expenses in settling down initially in that community.

I do not agree that we should even think about a

federal role of subsidizing teacher pay. I think it is inappropriate.

DR. DANEK: May I raise an issue? I don't think we're talking about subsidizing--it depends on what you call it. The National Science Foundation makes grants to universities all the time. We pay participant costs, which applies, in which money goes to high school teachers during the summertime in order for them to go to universities and to become [INAUDIBLE], in effect is their salary.

So, depending upon how you look at it, I don't think--we're talking about subsidizing teachers' salaries, that's a fact. But we're not talking about doing it in the form in which you're simply saying that the federal government is paying teachers' salaries.

I think that's different. We pay teachers' salaries in research all the time. We pay billions of dollars every year in the form of release time. Faculty get grants, they do research, and we buy out two months of their time.

We're talking about buying out a teacher's time, two months at a time, so that teacher doesn't have to go to work in Safeway, all right, and pack boxes. We're not talk--and that's the [INAUDIBLE], it's very different.

MS. BISHOP: It's augmenting salaries.

MS. WINKLER: I would also like to make one other point. That was on the idea that teachers were going to do all these other things. Somebody had an additional thought on it,

but, and that is, we're talking new teachers, we're not talking experienced master teachers who can get into developing curriculum and all these enhancements and so forth.

We're talking somebody right out of school, and it just does not seem realistic to me to say you're going to pay a new teacher to do all of this innovative development. It just doesn't make sense to me. [INAUDIBLE] what you said.

MS. FREEMAN: We didn't limit it to new teachers. We covered the spectrum. The focus at the moment is on new teachers because that's a very critical area, but we also talked about going to other disciplines and beefing up their skills in science and math.

English teachers, sociology teachers, we don't care where they come from, we just want to get teachers to go to, have a greater skill at teaching user-friendly science and math.

And I think you're dealing with detail here, instead of the broad concept.

MS. WINKLER: It's an important and expensive detail.

DR. DANEK: But if you go forward as--if you approach it as a salary supplement, you're absolutely right, OK? But if you approach it as a grant, then I don't think we'll have a problem.

MR. OAXACA: Let me take a poll here on how many people have to leave at 11:30, because I--we ought to have as many people here to listen to the rest of Ferial's input, you

know, with as many Task Force people as possible.

MS. BISHOP: I only have two more. I could just put it on the record.

MR. OAXACA: Yeah, well, why don't you quickly go through them, and that way, they'll know and then we can always...

MS. BISHOP: Go through them and then we can--the last two are small points. When federal dollars go to universities for fellowship and research and development awards, institutions of higher learning should be required to ensure that women, minorities, and handicapped are equitable participants of these types of awards.

And we talked about the lack of research assistance awards. And that they are fully integrated into the research pipeline.

Now, some may argue that if you ask a president, university president, he'll say, sure, my people are all fully integrated. And all I say is, show me the nearest stats which prove or can demonstrate that.

And I think that's what we're trying to say here.

MR. OAXACA: Did you address the issue that is always brought up as the bugaboo, you know, where people who want to keep you out of anything, they either say you're too young or too inexperienced or overqualified or too old. And then they throw in the issue of quality.

And then so you get in this thing where you never can

get off the track.

Did you address what the voices of doom will attack, you know, as far as, well, there went the quality? You know, and how do we address that in the Task Force. Did you address that in the Task Force?

MS. LEE-MILLER: The quality in what, Jaime?

MR. OAXACA: The quality of the scientist that you'll ultimately produce. There will be the general opinion by those elitists that are already there to say, uh oh, there went the neighborhood.

MS. LEE-MILLER: But you see, you mention a standard of excellence that...

MS. BISHOP: I said that, yeah, in the beginning, that this commission would be led by a presidential appointee or the president itself, that one of their charges would be to define what we mean by standards of excellence.

Somewhere along the line we've got to set up the criteria that would define this discussion.

MR. OAXACA: We've got to do it in a way against what the normal, what the establishment today sets as their standard of excellence. Otherwise, they will...

MS. BISHOP: That's correct...

DR. JENKINS: But I think we are not getting at the question you were asking, which is, how do you change the perceptions that minorities and women are able to do science.

MR. OAXACA: Exactly.

DR. JENKINS: And I think that you're simply going to have to do it with the evolution of people being in those roles that shows how competent they are. We heard it yesterday from people who are very, very competent.

MR. OAXACA: Sure.

DR. JENKINS: And it comes right into perceptions of teachers and whether kids can learn, the kind of high expectations they have from the time they come to preschool, to kindergarten, all the way through. And this is part of this.

But before people leave, I want to lay something on the table--because they don't have to agree with the recommendations that were made yesterday. But unless we address a tragedy in this nation, which is that Blacks get the poorest education in the public schools of any group.

MS. KEMNITZER: Yes, you're right.

MR. OAXACA: Oh, yes.

DR. JENKINS: Perhaps surpassed by American Indians because they have similar problems but different problems.

And if we don't address the issue that, number one, they are poorly taught, they lose ground beginning at grade three and get worse, they have more drop outs, we don't have the quality of teachers, they are not getting science and math.

Even if they get through high school, they are not encouraged to go on to college. When they get into college, they drop out. There is a problem with Blacks here now.

Dr. Horner yesterday indicated, although if you talk

about minorities and women, even in this Northeastern group of colleges, Black men are doing very poorly. I think you have got to look at some of these problems and address them as they relate to Blacks.

MR. OAXACA: Oh, yeah, absolutely.

DR. JENKINS: And our recommendations...

MR. OAXACA: Oh, and the numbers are dismal.

DR. JENKINS: If we don't [INAUDIBLE] ways to fix these schools, because unless we make public school authorities do a better job, or we get a better education, we are always talking about the little dribbles, rather than raising the water table.

MS. BISHOP: Once you take care of that, then I think you're concerned about quality of the individual.

MR. OAXACA: No, no, I'm concerned that there will be people out there trying to kill this thing, using that as an excuse.

MS. FREEMAN: Keep in mind that another goal of the Task Force is to raise the basic levels of scientific literacy of the nation in toto and in the Black subgroup most or particularly, and even the Black underclass.

So, we're looking to create new scientists and engineers, but we're also looking to create a new illiteracy standard for our science, engineering. That does not talk about quality. We're just talking people will be basically literate.

DR. DANEK: I think in developing those targeted or set-aside programs or any [INAUDIBLE], it depends--your acceptance of these programs will depend on whether or not your audience will perceive that you are simply providing funding to sustain a system that already does not work.

But to whether or not your programs are adjusted in such a way that the overall outcome of those programs may lead to select a group or an individual or an institution that at the present time may be slightly below your standard of excellence, but through the program clearly there is evidence that you expect that at the end of the funding period that it will be above the standard of excellence.

MS. LEE-MILLER: That's why we focus on the Black colleges, because they have a proven rate of producing doctors and scientists.

DR. DANEK: But the fact is--but the fact is you have to also look at whether or not they have a proven record which is equal to the dollar amounts that have been put into it.

The fact of the matter remains that even though they are the best in terms of producing scientists and engineers, there were only 41 Black Americans who got Ph.D. engineering degrees last year.

So, they are the best out of a system that's not working...

MS. BISHOP: One of the things that I don't have down here, that we touched upon, had to do with the fact of

homegrown folk. It was someone who told me that why should Harvard go down to the South to raid from an HBCU school the two or the 10 Ph.D.s that they produced, to bring them back to Harvard, when Harvard has an equally responsible role of making sure that Blacks are in Harvard and that they are getting Ph.D.s to also teach in this area.

So that we're talking about equity across the area, across the whole spectrum.

DR. JENKINS: I guess we also talked about alliances that should be developed between the HBCUs and the majority research universities. So that money is not just going one way. It's to go the whole set of relationships, market-type relationships [INAUDIBLE].

I also want to say that when we talked about the incentive grant, we even talked about the possibility of tying that to a research objective--what materials or strategies were utilized in the school that were most effective, so that you can build literature and share that information, to be replicted elsewhere.

DR. DANEK: I mean we were very aware of not just simply providing funding to sustain what is not working at the present time.

MS. MEJIA-WALGREEN: I want to make sure, though, that it's not just Blacks that we're--because when, Harriett, when you say, you know, the Blacks are getting the worst education. It is our inner-city, you know, our inner-city

Hispanic kids are just...

MS. BISHOP: Right [INAUDIBLE] was just a Black thing. One of the things that we had a problem with was trying to focus. You know, the charge was, are Black concerns interwoven into the document?

So we went from Black concerns, and we went beyond into the Hispanic and the, you know, we kept doing this, which is, I think, what Norbert talked about and some of the others, the fact that a lot of these are crossing over into the whole spectrum of minority people who don't have an opportunity--from whatever means--[INAUDIBLE]--their eyes above their own level of...

MS. MEJIA-WALGREEN: Even disadvantaged--maybe we want to...

MS. FREEMAN: Fine, but I do think that the Black experience in this country is very different than the Hispanic experience. Black...

MS. MEJIA-WALGREEN: I might argue about that...

MS. FREEMAN: Blacks continue, Blacks continue to be impacted by the remnants of what I call--are the remnants of the closed slave system. No other subgroup in this country, or the world, as a matter of fact, experienced the closed slave system as this country knew it.

And I think that the existence of self-esteem levels as low as they are in the Black community, particularly in the underclass, and the lack, the discouragement that the slave

system experience mandated continues today in terms of a discouragement of an intellectual curiosity.

I mean Black young people are absolutely discouraged to pursue intellectual pursuits, and that has an historical pattern in this country.

MS. LEE-MILLER: I don't think we want to debate who has got the most disadvantage, because...

MS. FREEMAN: No, I'm not, I'm not saying that. I'm not saying that. Everyone is--there are many disadvantaged people, economically and socially, in this country.

But I'm saying that you have to acknowledge that there are differences and the differences have historical beginnings.

DR. JENKINS: Right, but may I respond to Sonia's concern, because I felt that while we have been asked to take a look at the report to see if it was responsive to what we thought were the most pressing needs for Blacks, that all of our recommendations were going to be in a pool and we would all kind of decide what is the best way to articulate them, so they accomplish the broad objectives.

And I felt that if we came up with a recommendation that was really going to be effective in inner-city schools, or schools where you have large numbers of students who are...

MR. OAXACA: It would apply to Hispanics, too.

DR. JENKINS: ...are below the norm, that it would work across the board. I would have been surprised if it comes

out that it is only going to be narrowly focused on...

MS. LEE-MILLER: Can I make a request for...

DR. JENKINS: But you have got to address the issue, because if you don't go and look at the specific problem, you don't come up with what's going to...

MS. LEE-MILLER: Can I make a request for the next meeting? That we have a list of all the recommendations--one, two, three, four--all of them that we have talked about, just on two sheets or something, so we can do what Harriett suggested, look at them in a whole, not through the report, but just a very simple, A, B, C, D, E kind of list.

MR. OAXACA: Harriett, when you folks went through your discussions, one of the things that Blacks in the educational system have done, at least in my observation, well is your historical Black institutions.

Hispanics don't have that sort of thing.

Is there anything that can be learned and translated over with applicability to the winning features of that approach to Hispanics?

DR. JENKINS: There are some universities where you have substantial numbers, or at least larger numbers than others, and there are things going on there. The University of New Mexico. I think there are numerous colleges in California, for instance, whether it's Cal State Northridge or Cal State Los Angeles.

And the University of Puerto Rico--we just never

even...

MR. OAXACA: Are they learning from [INAUDIBLE] or are they learning from what's already been learned by.

DR. JENKINS: Essentially, you make sure youngsters have good educational experiences, and they supply any and all of the supports that are needed. So that if you need refresher courses--we even got into an argument about...

MR. OAXACA: No, but are they having some guy from Clark College go to the University of New Mexico and say, you know, here's how we did it down there in Georgia.

MS. LEE-MILLER: No, that's a very good suggestion. Maybe we should add to our suggestion, there needs to be information sharing among the various categories...

MR. OAXACA: Otherwise you're just reinventing the wheel.

MS. BISHOP: To take care of that--that was a suggestion on an appendix, which can be broadened to include other informational sources. But certainly with all of these hearings we've been holding, we ought to at least put down some of those innovative programs with a paragraph that describes what it has done and what it is doing, and a contact.

We believe that--and I think a lot of you believe--that money is not the only answer, that there are ways to either reprogram existing funds or to use what's already been created out there without having to reinvent the wheel, to apply in certain sections around the country.

MS. GUERRA: Jaime?

MR. OAXACA: Estella.

MS. GUERRA: One of the newer things that has happened--and I don't have too much information on it, but in the Southwest, there has been a Southwest Conference, not like a football conference, but a lot of the institutions, like Pan American College, University of New Mexico, those schools [INAUDIBLE] have very high Hispanic populations in the Southwest of the United States.

And it might be worth looking into that. But the point that I wanted to make while we are talking--and we've made a lot of recommendations that involve education and what needs to be done, whether it is for the historically black colleges or schools, and we also need to have, as part of our recommendations, something that's very clear that the schools need to prioritize also, because I'm not sure that it's always going to be where, by adding to the funding or increasing, I think schools themselves need to reprioritize or take a look at the national agenda or what we're trying to do.

Because in listening to some of the information that has come from the hearings, I'm not sure that there is a cohesiveness between--within the schools, realizing that they, too, have a responsibility in that setting their priorities.

MR. OAXACA: Ferial, is this a good time to have Sue tell us about the next meeting?

MS. BISHOP: Yes, this ends our report.

MR. HILL: I just want to say one thing.

MR. OAXACA: I'm sorry, I apologize, you had your hand up.

MR. HILL: I just wanted to make one comment, and I meant to mention it before.

Through my association with this group, I have developed a real healthy wealth of cynicism about the whole system, and I think [laughter], I appreciate that because...[laughter]

MR. OAXACA: You've refined your existing cynical approach.

MR. HILL: But I think we are making recommendations to a system that's really essentially bankrupt, especially for disadvantaged and economic disadvantaged learners. And I wish I had a counter recommendation to how to fix it, but I don't know how it can be fixed.

MS. BISHOP: I'm not sure if it's bankrupt, or if it's just a reprogrammed or mismanagement of areas.

MR. HILL: Maybe.

[Several people speak at once]

MR. OAXACA: Nina.

MS. WINKLER: Norbert, I think your point is well taken, especially in the poorest schools. One of our recommendations--we didn't talk about it very much--but it's very important because it seems to be a consensus developing from a lot of different fronts, even from the teachers unions,

and that is, that it's time to kind of cut loose from the janitors union and everything and let the schools take their money and be accountable for what they do with it, and not tie their hands down with all these different categories of money and rules and programs and control from the outside of the school.

And our proposal had a pretty complete, I guess, proposal for doing something like that, and I think there is going to be--we've got report after report coming out, one almost every month, or somebody with a proposal saying, it's time to stop trying to prescribe every possible solution.

We have these huge resources going into the schools. Let's let some people do what they can do and be accountable for the results and not worry so much about the process.

And I think that's the future, I really do.

DR. JENKINS: By the way--I'll just go ahead, because I was waiting for something.

MS. WINKLER: Sure.

DR. JENKINS: One part I thought was sort of missing, and we didn't have time last night, since we argued until late hours. Perhaps this report does have to address parents [several affirmative comments] and what needs to be done to alert them to how important it is from the earliest ages to have their youngsters explore, be curious, to expose them to all of the opportunities, even just educational TV.

CBS, I guess, or PBS has put out a little brochure

for parents, just how to use TV. And many poor families, although they are poor, do have televisions sitting in their homes, and I thought we ought to give some attention to that, what we are going to say and how we will address that, so we can encourage parents to support [INAUDIBLE].

MR. OAXACA: Absolutely. I'll turn it over to--oh, Alan, I'm sorry.

DR. CLIVE: Jaime, I just wanted to--at the risk of starting off a whole new thing, but I do want ask a question in regard to your comment about quality--"there goes the neighborhood," etc.

That's a real concern of mine, and [INAUDIBLE] has been shy by admitting their ignorance in this Task Force, and which I think is a good thing. And one area I'm ignorant is, we've heard a lot about the condescending attitudes toward women and minorities in science and engineering.

Does anybody have any knowledge about whether that is still true in the medical profession, pe se? Here I'm a complete layman, and I'm just thinking that--I don't, you know, I don't question when it is a female doctor. A doctor is a doctor, as long as they're Jewish, they're fine. [laughter]

MR. OAXACA: Right, Alan, Jewish doctor is redundant [laughter].

?: Unless they're female.

DR. CLIVE: And note here it's a capital J. [laughter]. But seriously,...

MR. OAXACA: I've been very involved. I'm on the advisory board to the dental associates at the USC School of Dentistry, and I have--the only thing I've seen is that because of the tuition problem is that you have very few Hispanics and even fewer Blacks going into dentistry.

DR. CLIVE: Well, look, here I'm talking...

MR. OAXACA: I have seen nothing that says that anybody has a concern about going to a Hispanic or a black dentist. I really haven't heard that. In fact, there is demand for those folks. So excellence is not an issue, at least in the dental profession.

DR. CLIVE: Yeah, the reason I raise women was because we are all familiar with the history of women's attempt to become doctors in this country, going back to Elizabeth Blackwell and the condescension that was faced.

But if that has, to some extent, dissipated, it might be a model that's worth studying as to how that happened, because certainly my impression is that the medical profession has not lowered its standards over the decades because of the admission of larger numbers of women.

And it's an argument that could be used to demonstrate the, no, indeed, you need not fear that the neighborhood is going to deteriorate if these other groups...

MR. OAXACA: I think the area that would be the proof of the pudding as I read--and I'm terrorized, because I hate the knife in any form--but you just don't read about women

surgeons or brain surgeons or heart bypass or any area that might be viewed as a more, as a higher risk surgical procedure.

You read about the Shumways and the Bernards and the Denton Cooleys, and whenever some politician gets sick, you see 96 male doctors that take care of him.

DR. JENKINS: By the ways, we also could look at NIH and who heads the major scientific R&D institutes there. They're still male.

DR. HAINES: I'll make a cynical comment. I think that there are more women in medicine because fewer men applied.

MR. OAXACA: I don't know about that, but I would take...

DR. HAINES: I think the data will support that.

MR. OAXACA: I would think, just as a person that uses that service as seldom as I can possibly figure out, you just don't see that many women out there, and even my daughter-in-law, who made the choice between a male obstetrician and a female obstetrician, she changed over to a male obstetrician right after she got married, where now she had to worry about having a baby, you know, and she made that choice, and her macho husband didn't force her into that, who is my son.

But so, I have no way to answer that, Alan. I hope I never see those guys.

DR. CLIVE: It sounds like [INAUDIBLE], yeah, there are still problem areas.

MR. OAXACA: I would suspect that it's like everything else, you know, you flack the competition, and that way you get the plum from this, and whatever is fair is fair. And if you've got to say, gee, she's really a neat lady, but, boy, have you ever seen her do that frontal lobotomy, she's really sloppy. Joe.

DR. DANEK: I wonder if other people would support this. I have the feeling that there are a lot of other studies that have been done--we've heard a few of them yesterday, "A Nation at Risk," the [INAUDIBLE] Report, a couple other things, and it would help me at least, and I'm not sure--I would like to know if other people would agree that, when that list of recommendations is given to us, that we are saying that we would like to recommend, that somewhere it be noted what other report made the same recommendation, and even possibly, what is the status of that recommendation? What has happened to it?

MS. KEMNITZER: Joe, may I say that there are 112 reports that pertain. Most of them have recommendations quite similar to the ones we're recommending. I don't mean to--I think your point is well taken. I'm trying to underscore it by saying that many, many people have recommended this, and clearly we have, we in this society have not got a very good score card on...

MS. LEE-MILLER: I think the point he's raising, though, is good. Strategy for release, I think, is another point. A lot of recommendations have been made over the years.

They haven't worked. Why didn't they work? Because the people who made them didn't put together a strategy to get them implemented.

So maybe at our next meeting, on our agenda, we might want to list, spend some time, half an hour [laughter] talking about strategy...[laughter]

MS. KEMNITZER: I would like to ask Nina Winkler if she would be able to help out with that, because it's going to be a tremendous investment of staff.

MS. WINKLER: The ones I agree with.

MR. OAXACA: Since Stephanie so shrewdly brought up the topic, we'll turn it over to have Sue give us the information for the next meeting.

MS. KEMNITZER: I don't mean to let, leave Stephanie out. I would like to ask her special help on the strategies points. Yes.

Let me say three things. I have the sense from hearing the discussion today and last night that virtually all of us were very taken by Gerry Holton's advice to us yesterday, and I will summarize it in three ways.

One, your results have to be data driven.

Two, you should have four or five recommendations. How many recommendations did we hear this morning? [Many simultaneous comments]

Two, you need to have more--three, I'm sorry--more specific action plan.

Does everybody agree with that? I certainly agree with that. [affirmative comments]

MR. OAXACA: I think before you set his report as the Bible, I think we ought to take a look to see what's happened on his report.

MS. KEMNITZER: No, no, this was advice to us on how we should write out report. And what I'm asking, is that your advice to Deborah and myself to redraft this over the next two weeks?

SEVERAL VOICES: No, no, no.

MS. BISHOP: If I may, I agree with Stephanie. We have heard a lot of recommendations today, and it seems to me that the first order of business is to put them all down, whether you agree with them or not, put them all down in one spot, and then come back and discuss each one.

Coming out of those large groups of recommendations, there could be some condensing, some shifting, some backing out, some strengthening.

I don't want to get into a numbers game right now. What I do want to do is see all these recommendations put in one place and then we all have a chance to look at them in toto.

DR. DANEK: But also I don't want to waste our time and our space in our report if I know that recommendation is halfway on to being approved [INAUDIBLE] some other committee...

MS. BISHOP: I agree with--Joe, I agree with you, I agree with you, and I agree with...

MR. OAXACA: Harriett, and then [INAUDIBLE].

DR. JENKINS: Perhaps the staff could help us by doing that, once they look at the list. One of the things, I think, and once we put on the table the things that we think are the most important, that we want to recommend, we might find that the grouping is different than the way the report is organized.

?: That's right.

DR. JENKINS: And I think it's going to come out with some strong stuff for what the federal government ought to do, some strong stuff about what the universities ought to do. And see, then they go across levels that are different than a K-12 or even higher education or even research.

And so I would just say that the look at those recommendations is critical...

MR. OAXACA: I think as far as Professor Holton's input, you know, that's another input.

DR. JENKINS: The other thing I hear is that we are distinguishing recommendations from action items, a plan of action, and I see recommendations as having action verbs. Are we agreed that [many affirmative answers], what the recommendations are action items or not?

?: They should be, they should be.

MR. OAXACA: Ms. Lopes.

MS. LOPES: She picked up on my thought. I think the roles are so important, the roles of the society, the roles of parents, academia, the media, and somehow to me all that has to be built into our recommendations, and part of our...

MR. OAXACA: And I would ask everyone to start thinking about, because--and we have to get the show on the road as far as debriefings. We have to start looking at that slide presentation or that view graph presentation, where we are in parallel going to go hit the road.

MS. BISHOP: Excuse me, Jaime. I must have missed the session there. Just in two seconds, elaborate on once this report gets into some document, what is the plan of attack?

I think I may have missed...

MR. OAXACA: Well, what we have in mind, in order to try to make this a media event, is to try to con the White House into having a corporate America breakfast, where there is a briefing for those folks, that there is a briefing for Bennett, you know.

There's a briefing for the cabinet level, the agency heads, to Orrin Hatch, to the architects of the language in Congress, to the governors, to the school boards, the mayors, the media, where we brief certain magazines.

And we have a spiffy briefing where different people on the Task Force will say, OK, you got Newsweek and Time, you know, let us know how it goes.

And we go down there and we go right into the

chairman of the board's office and we hit it that way. Ms. Lopes.

MS. LOPES: I absolutely agree with that. I think that whole approach is good. But I think our timing is critical.

And whether we do it, you know, at the end of an administration or whether we hit it at the beginning. In other words, I don't think we're going to give an interim report and then hit the streets with it. Are we going to take it to a new administration?

Like Carl Broker's [PHONETIC] commission is going to take his findings to the new administration. I guess we could set up a visionary path for four years here if we time it right.

MR. OAXACA: Well, what we would like to do is to get this thing to become a part of the dialogue in the platforms for the presidential election.

MS. LOPES: So you're going to take it to the candidates?

MR. OAXACA: The candidates, absolutely...

?: Take it to the people.

MR. OAXACA: And have that become, perhaps, part of the platform. Nina.

?: [INAUDIBLE] administration.

MS. WINKLER: I would like to return for a minute to the point Sonia made very early in the game and tied this to

Sue's point about an action plan.

What it sounds to me like is this month is not the month when we are going to take a final list of recommendations and flesh out additional steps to bring before this Task Force.

It sounds like this is the month when we are going to really distill down to a report that at least when the lights are dim begins to look like what we want, and then we are going to have to have one final wrestling match on what our recommendations are and how we want to structure their presentation.

At that point, we will know what we don't know right now, which is, how much more homework is needed to flesh these things out? Do we need to do more costing? That takes a lot of work.

That kind of--I assume when you're talking help in fleshing things out, Sue, that's the kind of thing you're talking about.

We're not ready to do that this month. We will probably be ready next month if we have a real good session and lots of time to talk.

MR. OAXACA: Well, I think we want to--we face the window of opportunity, so to speak, and pretty soon...

?: ...throw a rock through it.

MR. OAXACA: Pretty soon we'll be shaking out, you know. I don't think there is any real reason to brief Pat Robertson any more or Simon or those guys perhaps. But, you

know, it's starting to narrow down as to who are the guys that are going to be--who are the key senatorial folk that are out there going for a new seat.

If you are going to make this a national agenda, you have got to have a Sputnik.

MS. LEE-MILLER: There was one interesting strategy Admiral Watkins used with the AIDS commission. He issued an interim report, he had 178 recommendations, and he listed them just consecutive order.

He had his press conference--didn't notify anybody--had the press conference and said, "Today I'm forwarding my report to the president." I guess in our case it would be, "Today we're forwarding our report to Graham."

But he said that at the press conference, and then sent it out. And what's happened since then is it's--it was clearly stated it was interim--the Secretary of HHS then gave the report to all the institutes and asked them to analyze each one of the 178 recommendations and feed back the response to Watkins.

We might play with that as a strategy, in terms of our issing an interim report and asking for feedback, from whatever group wanted to give it to us, and then continue to meet and incorporate those ideas and then issue the final report after the new administration is in place.

SEVERAL VOICES: I like that. Makes sense to me.

MS. BISHOP: I guess I always thought that's what we

were going to do.

MR. OAXACA: Well, I would think that the best strategy is a combination of all of this. What gives you the most bang for the buck in getting people to get fired up, so that no matter who wins in November, they are going to jump on it.

And the second advantage of that is that if we screwed up, we can correct because we're still in business.

See, these people that wait until the end of the thing, they put out the report, I'm not too sure that turning over 178 recommendations to 17 agencies and waiting for feedback is the way to solve something.

MS. LEE-MILLER: You create a dialogue, that's all I'm saying, it was dramatic.

MR. OAXACA: Well, there's no solution to that one yet. So that's why...

DR. CLIVE: Stephanie, AIDS is a--pardon the expression--AIDS is hot sex, whatever you want to us.

MR. OAXACA: It's a sexy subject.

DR. CLIVE: It is on the national agenda. We are trying to get on the national agenda. I think Jaime perhaps has a more appropriate approach to make this the kind of issue we would like to be.

The unthreatening AIDS issue, you might say.

DR. DANEK: There also is another action item, I mean, that personally, I feel, that we as members of the

committee have. And that is, as members of the committee, as we develop these, we have a personal responsibility to try to implement as much as we can, in our own agencies, and we are trying to do that at NSF, and I would encourage other people to do it if they haven't already done that.

DR. JENKINS: Well, you're raising an interesting issue, which is that there were named federal agencies to this Task Force.

DR. DANEK: Correct.

DR. JENKINS: And whether any of us have gone back to our agencies to even share the array of recommendations, to start building commitment that we can be assured. So maybe there is something we ought to be doing...

MR. OAXACA: Well, that's why we want to brief the heads of the agencies.

DR. JENKINS: Well, if we've already prepared them when they come to the briefing [INAUDIBLE].

MR. OAXACA: You've presold them. Sue is going to tell us about the next meeting.

MS. KEMNITZER: Next meeting May 4th in Baltimore.

?: What day of the week is that?

MS. KEMNITZER: Wednesday. And then a--that will be a combined hearing then and meeting, and then a meeting on Thursday, May 5th, in Washington, DC. For out-of-towners, we have hotel rooms in Washington, and we will have a bus for anyone who would like to go up to Baltimore.

?: All day both days?

MS. KEMNITZER: Correct. In Baltimore, we will have bus transportation, after Stella is generous again. Stella, you know, has helped keep our operation going by transporting us to and fro.

And Thursday, May 5th, in Washington, DC.

?: Where?

MS. KEMNITZER: The Air and Space Museum.

SEVERAL VOICES: Far out. Great. Right under the Voyager.

DR. HAINES: Sue, will we have Wednesday night homework?

MS. KEMNITZER: Probably, yes, probably.

MR. OAXACA: Let me take this opportunity to thank all of you for making my job a kind of a fun job. This is a really sharp set of folks, and I'm delighted that you're all free electrons.

DR. JENKINS: Can we thank the staff for a fantastic hearing yesterday. We were just tremendously impressed [INAUDIBLE] Thank you very much. [Applause]

MR. OAXACA: Even the men did well.

DR. CLUTTER: That's true. I would also like to make one further non-controversial comment [laughter], and that is that it has been my experience in my long career of having to produce from time to time a document, sometimes almost out of whole cloth, just to bring a group to some sort of, to focus on

the issues at hand, and I think we ought to thank Deborah and Sue for having done that. [Applause]

MR. OAXACA: She put McNamara's book on hold, as a lower priority, and for that we are indebted to you.

MS. SPALLEN: I'm in debt, too.

[Meeting adjourned 12:01 p.m.]